

Also, resolution of the New York Florists' Club, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of the Commercial Law League of America, for the Lodge bill to reform the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George C. Henry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Laura Maxwell and 11 others, for extension of the Morris forestry law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Laura Maxwell and 11 others, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Laura Maxwell and 11 others of the State Federation of Pennsylvania Women, for a White Mountain reservation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of East Mauch Chunk, for the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. S. Kirkpatrick, for an amendment of national banking law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Association of Mexican War Veterans, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Illinois, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Clearing House, for bill H. R. 8973—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Wilson R. Solt, for the Heyburn pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Virginia A. Hilburn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bethlehem, N. Y., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of C. L. Upham Camp, Sons of Veterans, of Meriden, Conn., against bill H. R. 8183—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Mannin Brothers et al., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, for removal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of Division No. 14, Ancient Order of Hibernians, for a statue for Commodore Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, for the Gallinger subsidy law—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of John Young, against any appropriation for distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the International Association of Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States and Canada, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, for Federal control of railway rates and private car lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., for the Gallinger subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of State Charities Aid Association, for the pure food and drug bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Bankers' Association, for bill relating to bills of lading, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edmund J. James, for an educational commission for China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Robert S. Waddell, against the Du Pont powder monopoly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company, against the anti-injunction law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of business firms of St. Louis, for revocation of the post-office fraud order—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, Washington, D. C., for printing to be done in eight-hour offices—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Earl & Co., against anti-injunction legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of General Federation of Women's Clubs, for a scientific investigation of the industrial condition of women in the United States—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Ellenburg Center, N. Y., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Curtice Brothers Company, the Commercial Envelope and Box Company, the Church & Davis Company, the Eastman Kodak Company, the Watson-Stillman Company, the Barney & Smith Car Company, the Jamestown Lounge Company, the Pioneer Suspender Company, the H. H. Franklin Manufacturing Company, and the Westinghouse Machine Company, against the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the Brooklyn Central Labor Union and the New York Marine Trades Council, for building battle ships at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of citizens of Ohio, against bill H. R. 7067—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of A. Williams et al., for bill H. R. 12067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of Boston Grange, No. 142, for removal of the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of citizens of New York, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of citizens of Arkansas, for the Senate amendment to the statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of citizens of Arkansas, for statehood for Oklahoma and Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Edmund J. James, of Illinois, favoring sending an educational commission to China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, for Federal control of railway rates and private car lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Master House Painters and Decorators and the International Association of Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. E. Yoell, of the Japanese and Korean legation, for retention of present Chinese law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: Resolution of the State Horticultural Society, at Thorsley, Ala., asking regulation of transportation of farm products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Master House Painters of the United States, at Birmingham, Ala., for removal of tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Missouri: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Farrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Freda Burow—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Rosedale Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring bills H. R. 239 and 9328 (the Bates-Penrose bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, against restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 20, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to

the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9216) granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Mitchell.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1056) granting a pension to Galon S. Clevenger.

The message also announced that the House insists on its amendments to the bill (S. 956) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BRICK, Mr. POWERS, and Mr. LLOYD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15744. An act to abolish the office of Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States;

H. R. 15848. An act authorizing the sale of timber on the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation for the benefit of the Indians belonging thereto;

H. R. 16381. An act leasing and demising certain lands in La Plata County, Colo., to the P. F. U. Rubber Company; and

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution extending the time for opening to public entry the unallotted lands on the ceded portion of the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in Wyoming.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

H. R. 484. An act granting a pension to William Mayer;

H. R. 485. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Bantom;

H. R. 550. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Scott;

H. R. 628. An act granting a pension to David L. Finch;

H. R. 1058. An act granting an increase of pension to Alphonso H. Harvey;

H. R. 1071. An act granting an increase of pension to William K. Keech;

H. R. 1137. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham M. Kaufman;

H. R. 1205. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Bigger;

H. R. 1243. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Burton;

H. R. 1331. An act granting an increase of pension to Roswell J. Kelsey;

H. R. 1440. An act granting an increase of pension to Matilda E. Lawton;

H. R. 1460. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Renell;

H. R. 1553. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey J. Fulmer;

H. R. 1566. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lowry;

H. R. 1569. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Murray;

H. R. 1685. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Bedient;

H. R. 1742. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Daughenbaugh;

H. R. 1775. An act granting a pension to Alexander Kinnison;

H. R. 1787. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. West;

H. R. 1803. An act granting a pension to George S. Taylor;

H. R. 1809. An act granting a pension to Lener McNabb;

H. R. 1857. An act granting a pension to Emeline Malone;

H. R. 1888. An act granting a pension to William T. Scandlyn;

H. R. 1911. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Grogan, formerly Preston;

H. R. 1912. An act granting a pension to Julia A. Powell;

H. R. 1962. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Myers;

H. R. 1967. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Baker;

H. R. 1968. An act granting an increase of pension to John Monroe;

H. R. 1977. An act granting a pension to Emma C. Anderson;

H. R. 1997. An act granting an increase of pension to Sanford C. H. Smith;

H. R. 2006. An act granting a pension to Florence B. Knight;

H. R. 2060. An act granting an increase of pension to John Farrell;

H. R. 2080. An act granting an increase of pension to Sydney A. Asson;

H. R. 2088. An act granting an increase of pension to Sewall A. Edwards;

H. R. 2093. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Pitt;

H. R. 2100. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Wilde;

H. R. 2150. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Smith;

H. R. 2151. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia C. Wood;

H. R. 2244. An act granting an increase of pension to Fred Dilg;

H. R. 2245. An act granting an increase of pension to Troy Moore;

H. R. 2264. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert McAnally;

H. R. 2344. An act granting an increase of pension to Selden C. Clobridge;

H. R. 2443. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Mower;

H. R. 2614. An act granting a pension to General M. Brown;

H. R. 2705. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Perkins;

H. R. 2736. An act granting a pension to William Merideth;

H. R. 2749. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Flynn;

H. R. 2763. An act granting an increase of pension to Anthony Sherlock;

H. R. 2766. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Brown;

H. R. 2982. An act granting an increase of pension to Ansel K. Tisdale;

H. R. 2991. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Landis;

H. R. 3225. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Philbrick;

H. R. 3255. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Ray;

H. R. 3284. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Callahan;

H. R. 3384. An act granting a pension to Benjamin H. Decker;

H. R. 3397. An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Chrysler;

H. R. 3418. An act granting an increase of pension to John Snouse;

H. R. 3435. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Sallade;

H. R. 3452. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob McGaughey;

H. R. 3553. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Pick;

H. R. 3557. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Wilkins;

H. R. 3685. An act granting an increase of pension to James O. Tobey;

H. R. 3698. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Miller;

H. R. 3811. An act granting an increase of pension to James White;

H. R. 3981. An act granting an increase of pension to John McKeever;

H. R. 4219. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Keener;

H. R. 4257. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Durney;

H. R. 4596. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Hughes;

H. R. 4616. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. West;

H. R. 4704. An act granting a pension to Alice Rourke;

H. R. 4759. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Bullard;

H. R. 4810. An act granting an increase of pension to Jerome Goodsell;

H. R. 4816. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Sherwood;

H. R. 4823. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. C. MacFarlane;

H. R. 4832. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Yates;

H. R. 4989. An act granting an increase of pension to Dominick Arnold;

H. R. 5026. An act granting an increase of pension to Asa Tout;



- H. R. 5215. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie Little;
- H. R. 5383. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Davis;
- H. R. 5553. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver L. Kendall;
- H. R. 5564. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Cluck;
- H. R. 5615. An act granting an increase of pension to John Coleman, jr.;
- H. R. 5616. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar Schroeders;
- H. R. 5724. An act granting an increase of pension to William O. Gillespie;
- H. R. 5727. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Harris;
- H. R. 6009. An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters;
- H. R. 6066. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Lewis;
- H. R. 6148. An act granting a pension to Henry P. Will;
- H. R. 6177. An act granting an increase of pension to John Haack;
- H. R. 6395. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ward;
- H. R. 6453. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Marsden;
- H. R. 6507. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Busby;
- H. R. 6508. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Moore;
- H. R. 6918. An act granting an increase of pension to Heinrich Krundick;
- H. R. 6921. An act granting a pension to Eliza B. Wilson;
- H. R. 6936. An act granting an increase of pension to William Miller;
- H. R. 6988. An act granting an increase of pension to Seymour Cole;
- H. R. 7208. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Massey;
- H. R. 7223. An act granting an increase of pension to George Blair;
- H. R. 7229. An act granting an increase of pension to Slater D. Lewis;
- H. R. 7396. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Ball;
- H. R. 7412. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Collins;
- H. R. 7478. An act granting a pension to George W. Jackson;
- H. R. 7547. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Allison;
- H. R. 7615. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Tate;
- H. R. 7622. An act granting an increase of pension to Hermann Lieb;
- H. R. 7631. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Foster;
- H. R. 7765. An act granting an increase of pension to George Gaylord;
- H. R. 7770. An act granting an increase of pension to Burgess Cole;
- H. R. 7815. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Covell;
- H. R. 7827. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Uhler;
- H. R. 7883. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Dilts;
- H. R. 7984. An act granting a pension to Henry R. Hill;
- H. R. 8048. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Bottoms;
- H. R. 8063. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Coburn;
- H. R. 8161. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Douglas;
- H. R. 8176. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Bishop;
- H. R. 8202. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Guy;
- H. R. 8207. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Proctor;
- H. R. 8208. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Brainard;
- H. R. 8218. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Spangler;
- H. R. 8275. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Aucock;
- H. R. 8289. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Holt;
- H. R. 8376. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McConnell;
- H. R. 8607. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur Haire;
- H. R. 8642. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Crandell;
- H. R. 8739. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank N. Gray;
- H. R. 8826. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Mason;
- H. R. 8836. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Howell;
- H. R. 8917. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hines;
- H. R. 9127. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac L. Rerick;
- H. R. 9235. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate H. Kavanaugh;
- H. R. 9248. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. Butler;
- H. R. 9249. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Cromer;
- H. R. 9267. An act granting an increase of pension to William Cook;
- H. R. 9447. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Edmundson;
- H. R. 9593. An act granting a pension to Charles M. Priddy;
- H. R. 9860. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Hirst;
- H. R. 9887. An act granting a pension to George Saxe;
- H. R. 9955. An act granting a pension to James W. Baker;
- H. R. 10047. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ellicott;
- H. R. 10166. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Morgan;
- H. R. 10217. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Barnes;
- H. R. 10271. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen G. Smith;
- H. R. 10322. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar W. Calhoun;
- H. R. 10353. An act granting a pension to Thomas B. Davis;
- H. R. 10399. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Sands;
- H. R. 10478. An act granting an increase of pension to William McGowan;
- H. R. 10632. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Preston;
- H. R. 10677. An act granting a pension to Maria Elizabeth Posey;
- H. R. 10723. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin French;
- H. R. 10724. An act granting an increase of pension to David Bruce;
- H. R. 10725. An act granting an increase of pension to Etta D. Conant;
- H. R. 10770. An act granting a pension to Helen P. Martin;
- H. R. 10817. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Morgan;
- H. R. 10827. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Crittenden;
- H. R. 10886. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha S. Campbell;
- H. R. 10894. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Riley;
- H. R. 10897. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Deems;
- H. R. 10914. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hamilton;
- H. R. 10920. An act granting a pension to Mary Edna Cammeron;
- H. R. 11000. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Wilson;
- H. R. 11052. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Vance;
- H. R. 11065. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Pollard;
- H. R. 11071. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen E. Williams;
- H. R. 11078. An act granting a pension to Rosa Zurrin;
- H. R. 11107. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Fritts;

H. R. 11196. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Joslyn;  
 H. R. 11259. An act granting an increase of pension to Barnes B. Smith;  
 H. R. 11335. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Chandler, alias Thomas Cooper;  
 H. R. 11353. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Woodworth;  
 H. R. 11408. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Reed;  
 H. R. 11415. An act granting an increase of pension to Victoria Bishop;  
 H. R. 11416. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Belk;  
 H. R. 11516. An act granting an increase of pension to Marquis D. L. Staley;  
 H. R. 11557. An act granting an increase of pension to Clinton A. Chapman;  
 H. R. 11625. An act granting a pension to William C. Robinson;  
 H. R. 11687. An act granting an increase of pension to Matt Fitzpatrick;  
 H. R. 11689. An act granting an increase of pension to Byard H. Church;  
 H. R. 11742. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Culver;  
 H. R. 11745. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Billingsley;  
 H. R. 11849. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Young;  
 H. R. 11886. An act granting an increase of pension to Solomon R. Trueblood;  
 H. R. 11927. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin D. Weatherman;  
 H. R. 12090. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Stark;  
 H. R. 12229. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben I. Turckheim, alias Joseph Adler;  
 H. R. 12275. An act granting an increase of pension to Verelle S. Willard;  
 H. R. 12289. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Grissom;  
 H. R. 12292. An act granting an increase of pension to George T. Hill;  
 H. R. 12351. An act granting an increase of pension to John Foltz;  
 H. R. 12354. An act granting an increase of pension to Tillman T. Heridge;  
 H. R. 12391. An act granting an increase of pension to J. Frederick Edgell;  
 H. R. 12396. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hutchinson;  
 H. R. 12494. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Crane;  
 H. R. 12516. An act granting a pension to James S. Randall;  
 H. R. 12565. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Kincaid;  
 H. R. 12720. An act granting a pension to Sarah Duffield;  
 H. R. 12903. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Ferrier;  
 H. R. 12948. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bierley;  
 H. R. 12955. An act granting a pension to Lyman Critchfield, jr.;  
 H. R. 13035. An act granting an increase of pension to Maggie D. Russ;  
 H. R. 13161. An act granting a pension to Cynthia A. Embry;  
 H. R. 13165. An act granting a pension to Martin Nolan;  
 H. R. 13166. An act granting an increase of pension to William Evans;  
 H. R. 13282. An act granting a pension to Lydia B. Bevan;  
 H. R. 13348. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy F. Shelton;  
 H. R. 13402. An act granting a pension to John Reynolds;  
 H. R. 13611. An act granting an increase of pension to William Clough;  
 H. R. 13643. An act granting an increase of pension to Davis W. Hatch;  
 H. R. 13976. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Stalcup;  
 H. R. 14123. An act granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Spitzer, alias Gottfried Bruner;  
 H. R. 14358. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Morrow;  
 H. R. 14515. An act making it a misdemeanor in the District

of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances.

H. R. 14719. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Preston;

H. R. 15521. An act establishing regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts of the northern district of California, at Eureka, Cal.; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution amending joint resolution instructing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make examinations into the subject of railroad discriminations and monopolies, and report on the same from time to time, approved March 7, 1906.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Goodell Company, of Antrim, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denaturated alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Goodwill Council, No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Plaistow, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the National Consumers' League of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of New York City, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made for a scientific investigation into the industrial conditions of women in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Champaign, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "Hepburn railroad rate bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Vermilion County Medical Society, of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing Government regulation of indigent consumptives; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of the congregation of the Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for an investigation of the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sherwood, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of Local Division No. 158, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Reno, Nev., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill" and also the "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Red River Drainage League, of North Dakota, praying that an appropriation be made for the drainage of the Red River Valley in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the congregation of the Pleasant View Baptist Church, of Pawtucket, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Pleasant View Baptist Church, of Pawtucket, R. I., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of the Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the establishment in the Department of the Interior of a bureau to regulate child labor; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wiconisco, Pa., and a petition of Local Grange No. 108, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rohrsburg, Pa., praying for the removal of the internal-revenue tax on denaturated alcohol; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Conneautville, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit divorce



except for statutory offenses; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude all gambling matter from interstate express and telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a Sunday-rest law in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 1187, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rasselas, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the ratification of arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1187, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rasselas, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sending of gambling matter through the mails; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the East End Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of opium except in medical prescriptions; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented petitions of the Woman's Study Club of Michigan City, of the Research Club of Aurora, in the State of Indiana, and of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of New York City, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made for a scientific investigation into the industrial conditions of women in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Hope Grange, No. 2101, Patrons of Husbandry, of Aurora, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "Hepburn railroad rate bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of A. C. Amsden Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial to the St. John's Benevolent Society, of Vincennes, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of Indian trust funds for the purpose of educating Indian children in sectarian schools; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Roberts Park Church, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings and grounds, and also remonstrating against the repeal of the present anti-liquor law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Northern Indian Historical Society, of South Bend, Ind., praying that an appropriation be made for the preservation of the U. S. frigate *Constitution*; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Indiana Society, Sons of the American Revolution, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a petition of the Indiana Society of Colonial Wars of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side for manufacturing purposes; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of New Albany, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Retail Merchants' Association of Fort Wayne, Ind., and a memorial of Post H, Travelers' Protective Association, of Vincennes, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Retail Merchants' Association of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to consolidate third and fourth class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of De Smet, S. Dak., and the petition of T. E. Robinson, of Lake Andes, S. Dak., praying for the removal of the internal-revenue tax on denatured alcohol; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the History Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and a petition of the Woman's Club of Pierre, S. Dak., praying for an investigation into the industrial condition of the women of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Orange, N. J., and a petition of the Traveler's Club of Newark, N. J., praying that an appropriation be made for a scientific investigation into the industrial conditions of women in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Atha Tool Company, of Newark, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "Williams-Mallory bill" relative to national quarantine; which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Caldwell, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denatured alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 305, Iron Molders' Union, of Plainfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2543) for the relief of William Pinkerton, jr., Mary McKellar, Eleanor Culley Stevenson, Sarah S. Patterson, and Rachael Salina Reynolds, heirs at law of William Pinkerton, deceased, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. KEAN. I trust the report in that case will be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed under the rule.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 12541) granting an increase of pension to Edward V. Miles;

A bill (H. R. 14330) granting an increase of pension to Sumner P. Wyman;

A bill (H. R. 15870) granting a pension to Mary Palmer;

A bill (H. R. 6946) granting an increase of pension to Elias Clauch;

A bill (H. R. 14888) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Bunker;

A bill (H. R. 13959) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Mouser;

A bill (H. R. 14563) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Higgins;

A bill (H. R. 13627) granting an increase of pension to Homer F. Herriman, alias George F. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 13710) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 12393) granting an increase of pension to William Hardy; and

A bill (H. R. 12540) granting an increase of pension to Morris J. James.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11129) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lindsey, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7585) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Girdler;

A bill (H. R. 6557) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jasper;

A bill (H. R. 9617) granting an increase of pension to David A. Kirk;

A bill (H. R. 14089) granting an increase of pension to Martin Harter;

A bill (H. R. 4809) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hatfield;

A bill (H. R. 9896) granting an increase of pension to William McKenzie;

A bill (H. R. 9995) granting an increase of pension to Elias Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 10594) granting an increase of pension to James Martin;

A bill (H. R. 11638) granting an increase of pension to John N. Vivian;

A bill (H. R. 12014) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Frasier; and

A bill (H. R. 13150) granting an increase of pension to Cate F. Galbraith.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13597) granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Bozarth;

A bill (H. R. 12825) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bloomer;

A bill (H. R. 13505) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Chambers;

A bill (H. R. 13502) granting an increase of pension to John N. Buchanan;

A bill (H. R. 13988) granting an increase of pension to Mary McMahon;

A bill (H. R. 14538) granting an increase of pension to Eliza L. Norwood;

A bill (H. R. 14426) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Menefee;

A bill (H. R. 14925) granting an increase of pension to James Grizzle; and

A bill (H. R. 14425) granting an increase of pension to Robert Henderson Griffin.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2745) granting an increase of pension to Zerelda N. McCoy, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4440) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kauffman, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4785) granting an increase of pension to Nehemiah Brundage, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4786) granting an increase of pension to George W. Coughanour;

A bill (H. R. 14890) granting an increase of pension to James H. Posey;

A bill (H. R. 14848) granting an increase of pension to Samantha E. Herald;

A bill (H. R. 13761) granting an increase of pension to John Cook;

A bill (H. R. 13525) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Hensley;

A bill (H. R. 13081) granting an increase of pension to Orren R. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 13083) granting an increase of pension to Mordcai B. Barbee;

A bill (H. R. 13230) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Webb;

A bill (H. R. 13231) granting an increase of pension to Gatsy Mattucks;

A bill (H. R. 13527) granting a pension to Willard V. Shepherd;

A bill (H. R. 12834) granting an increase of pension to Theodor Schramm; and

A bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Williams.

Mr. KITTREDGE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2769) to divide Nebraska into two judicial districts, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4650) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDonald; and

A bill (S. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Maria Leuckart.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4826) granting a pension to Agnes B. Earl;

A bill (S. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Parker Norton; and

A bill (S. 4315) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Vose.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5485) granting a pension to Horace D. Mann;

A bill (H. R. 14793) granting an increase of pension to William W. Howell;

A bill (H. R. 14389) granting an increase of pension to Amos Hart;

A bill (H. R. 13872) granting an increase of pension to Alvin D. Hopper;

A bill (H. R. 13891) granting an increase of pension to Hugh G. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 13038) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Ramsey;

A bill (H. R. 13238) granting an increase of pension to William Strasburg;

A bill (H. R. 13311) granting an increase of pension to John Wilkinson;

A bill (H. R. 13310) granting an increase of pension to James McKee;

A bill (H. R. 13138) granting an increase of pension to Eada Lowry; and

A bill (H. R. 12760) granting an increase of pension to William Ralston.

Mr. FLINT, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1916) to provide for filling in that portion of the naval station at Honolulu, Hawaii, known as the Reef, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. DOLLIVER, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 5187) to purchase the original painting of Gen. Philip H. Sheridan on his favorite horse Rienzi, known as "Sheridan's Ride;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 5188) providing for the adjudication of the claim of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., by the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WETMORE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5189) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Joyce;

A bill (S. 5190) granting an increase of pension to Abby L. Brown (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. White (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 5192) granting a pension to John H. Stacy (with accompanying papers).

Mr. DICK introduced a bill (S. 5193) authorizing the President to place William Welsh on the retired list with the rank of captain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5194) for the relief of Mrs. Karl F. Kolbe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5195) granting an increase of pension to Sidney H. Cook; and

A bill (S. 5196) granting an increase of pension to Julius Bracher.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5197) to amend section 6, chapter 204, Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved March 3, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5198) granting an increase of



pension to Helen G. Heiner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5199) to correct the military record of John Layman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 5200) for the erection of a public building at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BURROWS. In connection with the bill I present a memorial of the public building committee of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., stating the reasons and showing the necessity for the construction of this building. I move that the memorial, together with the bill, be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 5201) to acquire certain land in the District of Columbia as an addition to Rock Creek Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 5202) granting a pension to Charles B. Newbury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5203) granting to the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, of Montana, a right of way through the Fort Keogh Military Reservation in Montana, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5204) to authorize the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Yellowstone River in Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5205) granting an increase of pension to John F. Alsup;

A bill (S. 5206) granting a pension to Eliza Lockhart;

A bill (S. 5207) granting a pension to Elizabeth Carroll; and

A bill (S. 5208) granting an increase of pension to John V. Sumner.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 5209) to correct the military record of Francis Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5210) for the relief of Ella Kepner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad to construct a bridge across Snake River between Washington and Idaho at or near Lewiston, Idaho.

The bill (S. 5211) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Snake River at or near Lewiston, Idaho, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 5212) to amend the military record of John J. Muehleisen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 5213) fixing and defining the north boundary line of New Mexico and a part of the boundary line of Oklahoma; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 5214) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Crouch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 5215) to fix the regular terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the southern division of the northern district of Alabama, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 5216) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 5217) for the relief of Benjamin Hubbard Frisbie; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 5218) for the relief of Maria J. Blaisdell, widow of William Blaisdell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 5219) granting an increase of pension to David N. Morland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 5220) for the relief of the

Mount Zion Society, of Fairfield County, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 5221) to regulate the practice of osteopathy, to license osteopathic physicians, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 5222) to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 5223) for the relief of the estate of W. C. Russell, deceased;

A bill (S. 5224) for the relief Thomas N. Arnold;

A bill (S. 5225) for the relief of James H. Fuqua;

A bill (S. 5226) for the relief of D. W. Price;

A bill (S. 5227) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Williams, deceased;

A bill (S. 5228) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. M. F. Sims, deceased;

A bill (S. 5229) for the relief of L. M. Northcutt;

A bill (S. 5230) for the relief of Robert Langston; and

A bill (S. 5231) for the relief of James S. Clark.

#### AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PLATTE submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the cashier of the United States Assay Office at New York to \$3,000 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ALGER submitted an amendment relative to the retirement with the rank and pay of major-general of officers of the rank of brigadier-general having creditable civil war service and who have served for two years or more in that grade, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that no permanent Army hospital exceeding in cost \$60,000 shall hereafter be erected unless by special authorization of Congress, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for grading and macadamizing Girard street, South Brookland, between Twelfth street and Brentwood road NE., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment providing that in computing the length of service in the Army heretofore or hereafter rendered, paymasters in the Army shall be credited with time served as clerks in the civil service, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. OVERMAN. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask that the amendment be read and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The amendment was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Add on page 11, section 9, after the word "jurisdiction," "but no writ of injunction or interlocutory order shall be granted by any district or circuit court without first giving five days' notice to the adverse party or his attorney of the time and place of moving for the same, nor until petition and answer are filed and hearing thereon is had."

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. CLAPP submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. TELLER, it was

*Ordered*, That C. W. Sanborn be authorized to withdraw the affidavits on file with Senate bill 586, there having been no adverse report on the same.

On motion of Mr. NELSON, it was

*Ordered*, That all papers in the files of the office of the Secretary of the Senate relating to the bill (S. 5162, Fifty-eighth Congress) for the relief of the next of kin of Christian Reimers, be withdrawn, there having been no adverse report on said bill.

## FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14171) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it may be now read for the consideration of the amendments made by the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Armament of fortifications," on page 4, line 5, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three hundred and ten" and insert "six hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, manufacture, and test of mountain, field, and siege cannon, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 21, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That the unexpended balance of \$39,302.16 of the \$40,000 appropriated by act of March 3, 1903, for cast-steel top carriages for 12-inch mortars, is hereby made available for the purposes above named.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 7, to insert:

## POWDER FACTORY.

For the erection and equipment of a powder factory, with its necessary communications and accessory structures, upon such reservation now or that may hereafter be under the control of the War Department as may be selected by the Secretary of War, \$125,000.

Mr. PERKINS. At the request of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] I ask that this amendment proposed by the committee may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, under the head of "Fortifications in insular possessions," on page 8, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended at Subig Bay, Philippine Islands.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to this amendment, which it seems to me ought not to pass.

I think that Subig Bay should not be specifically cut out from this appropriation. We have already expended something like two million and a quarter at Subig Bay. If we should leave the islands at any time, that is the naval station we should retain. If we remain in the islands, that is the naval station we ought to use.

You can not get a big ship within a mile of Cavite. You have got great depth of water at Subig Bay, sufficient to take our largest ships. It is a harbor easily defended. There are two channels, only one of which can be used, and there is an island in the middle. The whole opening is not more than a mile and a half or two miles wide. There is deep water inside. That is where the great dry dock which is being towed across the ocean is going.

To refuse to make fortifications there if, in the opinion of the Army and Navy, that is the proper place, seems to me to be most unwise. Subig Bay was first selected by the naval board. It was then submitted to the joint board of the Army and Navy, and met with their unanimous approval. We have spent, as I have said, a great deal of money there already. It is certain to be the naval station of the islands in any event, whether we hold them or whether we leave them. I think to refuse in this bill to allow any money to be spent there is a very great mistake.

This amendment was discussed fully in the House and overwhelmingly defeated. I think we ought to follow the advice of the naval and military board, and we ought not to limit them in the expenditure of this money in cutting out one particular place in the Philippine Islands, and that place the one which has

been selected for a naval station and on which we have already expended a great deal of money.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I agree in part with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, and the only thing which causes me to doubt whatever the conclusion he reaches that Subig Bay is the proper place on which we should make an expenditure is the matter which he himself brought to the attention of the Senate some days ago, in which he disclosed the fact, a very important one, of the existence of certain small islands on the east coast, if I recollect correctly, where there are large coal measures. The immediate object of his then bringing that to the attention of the Senate was to authorize certain steps to be taken by the Government for the acquisition of the property. If I remember further correctly, the statement was made at the same time by the Senator that not only were there coal measures there, but a very fine harbor.

I quite agree with the suggestion that we, in any event, will retain and should retain, either immediately on the island of Luzon or in some other part of the Philippine Islands, what can be hereafter utilized as a coaling and naval station. The only question in my mind as to the propriety of designating Subig Bay now as the place is the one which has been raised by the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not desire to interrupt the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing to be interrupted if the Senator desires to interrupt me at this point.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to ask the Senator a question; I was merely going to make a statement—

Mr. BACON. Yes; I am perfectly willing the Senator should make it.

Mr. LODGE. A statement in regard to the island of Batan. The island of Batan lies on the extreme southeastern coast of Luzon, as the Senator is aware. It is a place easily accessible either to merchant ships or ships of war, coming from the United States or going to the United States. But it is not in a very accessible place for the Asiatic fleet, which necessarily spends its time on the coast of China and India. Wherever our naval station ought to be it ought to be upon the China Sea.

Moreover, Batan is far distant from any labor market. That is the objection to Subig Bay. The only argument in favor of Cavite is that it is nearer Manila, where labor can be secured. But Subig Bay is very near to Manila as compared with the island of Batan.

The island of Batan has the coal measures. It has a good harbor, as the Senator says. But after long consideration, Subig Bay was selected as the best place for our naval station, and there a large expenditure of money has already taken place. I think in any event that would be the naval station of the islands.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I quite agree in the estimate of Subig Bay, and prior to the suggestion to which I have alluded as having been made by the Senator from Massachusetts I never had any question in my mind as to the fact that Subig Bay is the proper locality for the expenditure of money in the making of fortifications with a view to a naval and coaling station.

From some little personal knowledge, I quite agree with what the Senator says as to the undesirability of Cavite. It is not only lacking in water, but there is no harbor there. Manila Bay is a body of water some 30 miles in diameter. It itself is not a harbor, but it is as large as a sea, and in times of storm it is tempestuous, and it is impossible for ships to find any safe anchorage there. The only harbor we have inside of Manila Bay at all is an artificial harbor, which was made by a sea wall at Manila, but it is utterly unadapted to the purposes of a naval and coaling station.

The objection which I would suggest to this paragraph is not that it proposes to cut out Subig Bay, but that it fails to designate with particularity where this money shall be spent. I would very much prefer not simply that the amendment should be cut out, but that there should be another amendment which should require that it should be spent at Subig Bay. As it is, even with that cut out, while Subig Bay will be eliminated, there is no limitation upon what other place may be selected and where money may be spent which may hereafter be of no benefit to us.

While of course it is not definitely formulated in our minds, the general consensus of opinion is that the time will come when our holdings in that country will probably be limited to such as may be necessary for our military and naval purposes; and I think the Senator from Massachusetts is correct that the agreement between the military and naval officials is that of all the places Subig Bay is the place. It is immediately north of



the entrance to Manila Bay. It is on the China Sea, and within easy access of all the Chinese ports, and is in itself the best place by reason of its physical features, aside from its locality.

So, while I shall not myself offer any amendment, and I do not know what may be the reasons which have actuated the committee in offering this amendment, I would very much prefer to see not simply the amendment rejected, but another one put in the place of it which shall designate Subig Bay. I think it is to our interests to do so.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to call attention to the fact that the clause as it came from the House did not oblige the War Department or fortifications board to spend the money at Subig Bay. It left it within their control to say where the money in the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines could be most judiciously spent. This amendment simply cuts out specifically the one place which it is agreed by all military and naval authorities is to be the great naval station, and upon which we have already expended a great deal of money, and which we must fortify sooner or later. If we do not do it in this bill, it will be done in the naval bill; and we ought not to tie their hands, as it seems to me, against this one place, which is the place of all others where money is to be spent for fortifications and for a naval station, if it is to be spent anywhere.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator, as he is on the subject, if he knows what amount has been spent at Cavite, or has there been any amount spent there in the way of fortifications?

Mr. LODGE. I am not aware that any amount of money has been spent at Cavite. The Senator stated the case in regard to Cavite perfectly. I can add nothing to it. And he has had the advantage of having been there.

Mr. BACON. Any money spent at Cavite is money lost, in my opinion.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is money lost; and the effect of this amendment would be to throw the expenditure at Cavite, if it went anywhere.

Mr. BACON. Cavite, as I endeavored to state before, is not only a place of shoal water—and there is no harbor there—but when the wind is from the direction of Manila—I do not know the points of the compass exactly—it is impossible for any ship to ride at anchor at Cavite on account of the rough sea.

Mr. PERKINS obtained the floor.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from California yield to me for one moment?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. This matter of a naval station was a good deal discussed when we were in Paris. There were several naval officers and Army officers before us and men who were entirely familiar with the Philippine Archipelago, and a suggestion never was made of any place for a naval station except the point mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not believe there is any other place on the archipelago that is at all fit for a naval station except this point.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, your committee having this subject-matter under consideration desired in their recommendation to the Senate to do that which to them seemed to be most practicable. There are several reasons which induced them to amend the bill, providing that no part of this sum should be used in the fortification of Subig Bay.

This amendment is recommended not particularly because of prejudice against Subig Bay, for, as has been said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], we agree that that is a very desirable place; that it is a good harbor, being 30 miles in length and some 10 or 12 miles in diameter, with water varying from 10 to 15 fathoms. But the estimates made by the Department for the fortification of our insular possessions were greatly reduced. The estimates made by the Department amounted to \$9,969,662.90. That was reduced quite 50 per cent. In this bill making an appropriation of nearly \$600,000 for fortifications in Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, and Manila and Subig Bay, they have recommended that no part of this sum shall be expended in Subig Bay, for the reason that they believe there are not sufficient funds to make a showing of any value to the Government there.

They also took into consideration the fact that as to Cavite and the port of Manila, the islands of Corregidor and Caballo at the mouth of the harbor or bay of Manila are a natural fortification. There is scarcely another harbor outside of San Francisco and Sydney that has the natural advantages that the port of Manila has for fortification. Manila is a city of 220,000 people, with millions of dollars of property belonging to the Government, yes, tens of millions of dollars, and it is surely the part of wisdom for the Government to fortify the entrance to that port.

As to the harbor at Subig Bay, there is nothing now there. The Senator is mistaken as to the amount of money which has been expended. I want to read to him from the official report—

Mr. LODGE. The Dewey dry dock will be there.

Mr. PERKINS. The dock is not yet there.

Mr. LODGE. Well, we hope it will get there.

Mr. PERKINS. We all hope so. If it had been built in San Francisco it would have been there by this time. If it had been built at Mare Island, Cal., it would have been about 5,000 miles nearer to the Philippine Islands than it was when it left the Atlantic shore. We shall pay \$25,000 in tolls for that dock and her towing vessels passing through the Suez Canal. If it had been built in California, the freight across the continent would not have amounted to nearly so much as you will pay for tolls through the Suez Canal. The money would have been paid out to our own workmen, and it would have been kept in our country, in accordance with the principles of the declaration which my friend from Massachusetts has so often made, and to which I most heartily subscribe—that we should keep our money at home and spend it amongst our own people. I hope, however, that the dry dock will reach the Philippine Islands in safety.

Mr. LODGE. But I beg to suggest to the Senator from California that there are American workmen on the Atlantic coast as well as on the Pacific coast.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; but I am referring more particularly to the tolls we are paying the Frenchmen and the Englishmen, who own the Suez Canal, for going through it. Had the dock been built on the Pacific coast that money could have been spent in this country.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator a question for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Where was that dry dock built?

Mr. PERKINS. At a port on the Atlantic coast—Sparrows Point, Md.

Mr. SPOONER. "The Atlantic coast" is very indefinite. I should like the Senator to tell me precisely where it was built.

Mr. PERKINS. I have just stated, though the Senator evidently did not hear me, that it was built at Sparrows Point.

Mr. SPOONER. Now I know.

Mr. PERKINS. It was built by the Maryland Steel Company at Sparrows Point, near Baltimore. Since the Senator from Massachusetts has referred to this matter, I want to give the distances to Manila by the Atlantic and Pacific routes:

	Miles.
New York to Gibraltar	3,215
Gibraltar to Port Said	1,920
Suez to Aden	1,310
Aden to Colombo	2,130
Colombo to Singapore	1,560
Singapore to Manila	1,350
Total	11,515

If that dock had gone directly through to Manila, it would have gone 11,515 miles; but it seems it stopped at the Canary Islands. I hope, however, it will finally reach its destination.

If the dry dock had been built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard, on the Pacific coast, the following would have been its course:

	Miles.
San Francisco to Midway Islands	2,770
Midway to Guam	2,302
Guam to Manila	1,506
Total	6,578

Thus it appears that the difference in favor of sending this dock across the Pacific would have been 4,937 miles.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. It seems to be a pretty plain case, as the Senator puts it, that the public interest would have been much better subserved by the construction of that dock in California; and I ask why was it not constructed there?

Mr. PERKINS. If I had had my way, it would have been; but unfortunately my friend from Massachusetts had more influence than I.

Mr. LODGE. I did not even know where it was built.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator spoke of the dock.

Mr. LODGE. I asked the Senator where the dock was built, and he said it was built at Sparrows Point, near Baltimore. I merely suggested, in speaking of American labor, that there were American laborers on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. PERKINS. I spoke of the tolls for going through the Suez Canal.

Mr. LODGE. What bearing that has on Subig Bay I do not know.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator said the dry dock was to go to Subig Bay, as I understood.

Mr. LODGE. It is not yet there, but we hope it will be there.

Mr. FRYE. When is it supposed it will reach there?

Mr. PERKINS. I see it stated this morning that it is supposed it will reach there by Christmas. At the rate of progress it has been making I think it will be long after Christmas before it reaches there.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I only wanted to suggest that possibly because the dry dock was not built in California shipyards the Senator from California, in charge of the bill, is punishing Subig Bay.

Mr. PERKINS. On the contrary, if the dry dock was at Subig Bay, Mr. President, I think your committee would perhaps have been in favor of making an expenditure at Subig Bay.

I have said nothing in relation to the large sums required to pay for the coal which these vessels use in addition to the cost of towing the dock from a shipyard on the Atlantic coast. However, this is all parenthetical.

But suppose the dock reaches Subig Bay, there is nothing there; there is no naval station as yet, unless it be on paper.

Mr. LODGE. There has been something like a million dollars spent there already.

Mr. PERKINS. That is not enough for the foundation. I will read to the Senator from the official report—

Mr. LODGE. I have the official report also. They have begun the erection of a barracks.

Mr. PERKINS. When the dock reaches there, we have automobile torpedoes, we have submarine mines and submarine boats, and we can easily protect that dock with very much less expense than it would be to build fortifications for which we have had no particular plan as yet presented to us. When I was a boy in Maine, when I went with the lumbermen into the woods to get out timber, in the first place we cut down the trees, then ran the chalk line to see what it would square up, and then they would hew to the line. If you were building a fence or a house, you would first make a plan, so as to know what that fence or house was to be constructed of and what it would cost you before you expended any amount of money upon it. That is one of the principal reasons that influenced your committee in making this report—that the Department has submitted no plan to your committee for the construction of fortifications at Subig Bay. In the report of the commanding general of the Philippine Islands, he says this:

The division commander visited Olongapo and Subig during the year. No naval establishment of importance now exists or is being installed in Subig Bay that requires land defense. The fortification of this point should not be undertaken until Manila is well protected, for if this port is captured the Philippines are lost. The defense of Manila against a naval attack will be a very serious proposition, as the entrances are broad and the water deep and heavy batteries will be required with accessory means of defense. To the undersigned it seems manifest that Cavite, where is now property of considerable value to the Navy, is a very important strategic point for a naval base. Certainly this will be the most important naval arsenal in the Philippines until Olongapo is thoroughly fortified.

The report was made in 1903. I have here before me the report made by the commanding general of the Philippine division in 1904 and the report of General Corbin for 1905, and no mention is made in either of Subig Bay.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. If it will not inconvenience the Senator, I should like him to come back to Cavite and to Sparrows Point. It seems to me a very extraordinary proposition that this dock, which could have been constructed as well at Mare Island, 5,000 miles nearer to the destination to which it was to have been towed, should have been built on the Atlantic coast. I can not understand it.

Mr. PERKINS. It seems so to me, Mr. President, but I do not wish to reflect on our naval authorities.

Mr. SPOONER. Was there any issue made at the time upon the place where it should be built?

Mr. PERKINS. It was left in the discretion of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. I think it was done under their supervision.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon the suggestion—I

do not know that it is correct or upon what it is based—I do not know what were the controlling reasons with the Department, but it is a fact that in the carrying of that great structure from this country to the Philippines, in going across the Pacific Ocean there would be very long reaches, thousands of miles, along which there would be no possible port of refuge in case of trouble. On the contrary, in going by the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean, around by way of Singapore, along almost the whole route there is no place where within less than a thousand miles a port of refuge could not be found. That, however, may not have operated to influence the decision of the Department.

Mr. SPOONER. That may be a good reason.

Mr. BACON. From here to Gibraltar is the longest reach they would have in making that journey, unless you consider the passage across the Indian Ocean, and along the Indian Ocean they are nearer to the coast of Arabia, the coast of India, going to Colombo, than the distance to any possible refuge that could be availed of in going across the Pacific.

Mr. PERKINS. I think, if my friend from Georgia will consult the atlas, he will find that from San Francisco to Hawaii, from Hawaii to the Midway Islands, from the Midway Islands to Guam, and from there to Manila, there are stopping places, and there will be only a few hundred miles difference between stopping places on that route and by the route which has been taken.

Mr. BACON. I will suggest to the Senator from California, that there is nothing at the Midway Islands which could possibly furnish any relief in time of trouble in such a case; there is nothing there, nothing but a coral reef. Up to the time when the cable was landed there, there was not an inhabitant upon those islands, nor is there any possible place where that great structure could find refuge in time of trouble.

Mr. PERKINS. That is very true.

Mr. BACON. If you leave out the 2,000 miles from San Francisco to the Hawaiian Islands, and if you leave out the Midway Islands, practically there is no port or place of refuge between the Hawaiian Islands and Guam. How far from California is it?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator is correct in his statement; but there was no need of this dock starting off without carrying sufficient fuel, and the ships that accompany it, the colliers and tugs, should have sufficient coal to go direct from Cape Charles to Gibraltar; but they could have followed the great sailing circle by way of the Aleutian Islands, and have taken that route. But I have only incidentally referred to that.

I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the same Government officers in the Navy, who have been educated at the expense of the Government—and none are more capable and more thoroughly equipped than they are—those same officers would have superintended the construction of the dock on the Pacific coast who did so on the Atlantic coast. Therefore I see no reason, as the Senator says, why it should not have been constructed there. Certainly the reason given by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is not an answer.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator would not mind my asking a question not relating to the voyage of the dock, I would say the Senator is a distinguished and leading member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He has just told us that there is nothing at Olongapo; and yet last year he reported a bill containing these items:

NAVAL STATION, OLONGAPO, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS: Repairs to existing buildings, \$25,000; drainage canal, to complete, \$25,000; water system, to extend, \$20,000; roads and bridges, \$5,000; sewer system, \$15,000; tools for general use, \$2,000; hoisting machinery, \$4,000; rock crusher and appurtenances, \$4,000; in all \$100,000.

That is a paragraph in the last naval appropriation bill for the maintenance and prosecution of work at Olongapo, which the Senator from California says does not exist.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator is correct in the statement that I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, although I am not, as he says, very distinguished. It is true that that committee reported in favor of the appropriations which he has read; but let me read to my friend from Massachusetts what the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department says in the report for 1905. This is his language:

(b) Olongapo.—The progress of work at Olongapo has not been as satisfactory as was hoped. In a measure this is due to the great amount of preliminary work required to prepare the site for the proposed station, and to the fact that the appropriations have not been made in accordance with the natural sequence in which the work of building up should be undertaken. Careful estimates have been made of the manner in which money for the building up of Olongapo could be most economically and judiciously expended. Since the land for the site has to be raised from 3 to 5 feet above its present level, the time required to establish a repair station at this place will be between six and seven years, and the estimated cost will be \$4,000,000. This should establish a plant which would have a somewhat better output and better facilities than the present station at Cavite.



We made the appropriation, Mr. President. Here is the report of the chief of that Bureau, which I have just read. It is self-explanatory. We make appropriations for many purposes, but sometimes it is not deemed expedient by the officers who have the disbursement of the money to expend it.

Now, let me read what the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks says about Subig. I want to say in passing, Mr. President, that your committee have the same object in view that the Senator from Massachusetts has. We only want to do that which is for the best interests of the service and the best interests of the Navy Department.

Mr. LODGE. Now, let me ask the Senator at that point, does the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy ask to have Subig Bay prohibited from this expenditure?

Mr. PERKINS. They do not.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Board ask for it?

Mr. PERKINS. I have read the message of the President, which came to us—

Mr. LODGE. You have put in a prohibition on the expenditure of the money at Subig Bay. I am not asking that you should require the expenditure of money there, but only that you should leave to the proper persons charged with the duty to say where the money shall be spent. This is a prohibition against spending it in one place in the Philippines.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I admit I have every confidence in the judgment, skill, and ability of the Board of Fortifications and Ordnance. I have before me their report, which was submitted to us late in March, preceded by the President's message of March 6, in which the President advised Congress that he had appointed a board consisting of the officers named to revise the Endicott plan for fortifications. Now, I want to answer the Senator from Massachusetts. I am speaking for myself personally. I recall the argument he made when he presented the bill to the Senate a few weeks since and asked unanimous consent, which was granted, to have appropriated \$50,000 to purchase a mining claim, a mining location in the island of Batan, and the Senate unanimously passed that appropriation bill. I think they did so because of the persuasive argument used by the Senator from Massachusetts, who, it will be remembered, dilated upon the great advantages of this great bay in the island of Batan, which is capable of holding a whole naval fleet. He stated that there were great coal deposits on the island and that it was a Government reservation. I have looked it up on the map this morning—and have the atlas before me—to find just where the island of Batan is.

Mr. LODGE. The island of Batan is on the southeastern coast of the Philippines.

Mr. PERKINS. It is on the eastern side of the archipelago. It is only 500 miles from Manila. It is within 50 miles of the Straits of San Bernardino, which straits are the gateway to the Philippine Islands from San Francisco.

Mr. LODGE. How far is Subig Bay from Manila?

Mr. PERKINS. Seventy miles. Batan Bay would be just as near, under certain conditions, as Subig Bay, for if there was a fleet lying off there with torpedos or a coast-defense vessel it would be impossible for a navy to come out and engage them without meeting with defeat.

San Diego, on the Pacific coast, is nearly 500 miles from San Francisco; yet we think it is only a pleasure trip to go down to San Diego. It is a pleasure trip; and the trip from Manila to Batan in the Philippine Islands might be equally delightful.

The hydrographic officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, whom I have interviewed, reports that Batan Island is a most excellent port of refuge. It has a splendid harbor, with 17 fathoms of water, and a ship drawing 42 feet of water can lie now within 100 yards of the shore. It is a Government reservation, and now wholly belongs to our Government.

As the Senator from Massachusetts was portraying the great natural advantages of this island from a nautical standpoint, the thought suggested itself to me what an ideal place for a naval rendezvous; what an ideal place for a naval station! The report of the Philippine Commissioners shows that the coal of this island has been worked for a number of years. The Government has been developing it, and if the extent of the deposit turns out as promised, a supply may be expected from the half of the island open to commercial companies that is estimated at 200,000 tons a year for the next two hundred years.

Mr. President, a battle ship without coal or liquid fuel is as helpless as a sailing ship at sea without wind. At Subig Bay there is no coal. There is plenty of water there, I notice by the report, although our estimates show that it will be necessary to sink wells for fresh water.

From the report of the committee of naval officers ordered to examine it I observe that 25.725 inches of rain fell in the month of June; 52.246 in the month of July; 37.765 in the month

of August, and 27.678 in the month of September. In those months there was certainly a deluge of rain which would have washed everything away.

So your committee thought, in considering this matter, that no injury could be done to the Government or to the port of Subig to expend this money upon the islands of Corregidor and Cabello at the entrance to Manila Bay. Believing so, we have made this recommendation, and I want to reiterate that we have no object in view except to do in an advisory sense what we believe the best interests of the Government require.

In making these appropriations we must consider the available fund we have at our disposal. We have cut down these estimates 50 per cent, and we believe to spread them over 70 miles from Manila Bay would not be advisable; that it would not be in the interest of economy or in the interest of the fortification of Subig Bay.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. CLAY. In connection with what the Senator is saying, let me call his attention to an item on the same page. I see that this bill carries about \$5,000,000. The House bill carries a little over \$4,000,000. The Senate has increased the amount nearly a million dollars—seven hundred and some odd thousand dollars. In going through the bill I notice on page 8 that \$1,452,000 of this \$5,000,000 is to be used in our insular possessions for the purpose of coast defenses, etc. I also notice on page 8, line 12, the following item:

For the purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defense for the insular possessions, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$565,000.

The House of Representatives thought that \$200,000 was a sufficient sum for that purpose. I have read the report of the House committee, and it is very difficult for me to understand how a House committee can say that only \$200,000 was necessary for this purpose and for the Senate committee to say that \$565,000 was necessary for the same work. To say the least, the Senate committee ought to be able to give the Senate some reason why this appropriation is more than double the amount carried in the House bill. I want to call the Senator's special attention to the fact that nearly two-thirds of this entire appropriation is to be used for our insular possessions.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I am much pleased to learn that my friend from Georgia has read the hearings before the House committee. I wish he had done the committee of the Senate the honor to have read the hearings held before that committee.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator has the Senate committee given us any report in regard to that matter?

Mr. PERKINS. Most certainly they have.

Mr. CLAY. I have the report before me here, and if there are any reasons given for it I have not been able to find them.

Mr. PERKINS. I will read them, then, to my friend. I read from page 21 of the statement of General Crozier before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

Senator PERKINS. In your letter to the Secretary of War you also make the following recommendation:

#### "GUN CARRIAGES FOR INSULAR POSSESSIONS.

"In providing for guns, carriages, and emplacements for the insular possessions in the acts of April 21, 1904, March 3, 1905, and the pending bill, the 12-inch guns and their emplacements have been carried ahead of the carriages therefor, so that the guns, carriages, and emplacements do not balance. The carriages are seven short of the necessary number, and to provide them the appropriation carried in lines 3 and 4 of page 8 should be increased by \$365,000, making the total sum appropriated under the item \$565,000. The discrepancy has been growing since the first act was passed, and results from misunderstandings arising in reducing the estimates made by the War Department, which, as submitted, balance."

This you explained to the House committee, General, but still they failed to act upon your recommendation.

General CROZIER. I did not have a complete opportunity to explain it to the House committee, because I did not know exactly the shape in which the bill was coming out of the committee.

Senator PERKINS. Will you explain to the committee the status of the case as it appears in your letter here and the reasons why you make this recommendation?

General CROZIER. Yes, sir.

There have been thus far two acts passed which carry fortifications and the armament thereof in the insular possessions. The discrepancy is confined to the emplacements and carriages and guns of the largest size, namely, the guns of 12-inch caliber.

By the act of April 21, 1904, there was a sum of money provided for emplacements for two 12-inch disappearing carriages; by the act of March 3, 1905, for four, and by this act, as it has passed the House of Representatives, for four more, making ten 12-inch emplacements; and authority has been given to use the guns therefor from those which we have on hand, not requiring a new appropriation.

By the act of April 21, 1904, the first of these before-mentioned acts, there was provided money for two 12-inch carriages, balancing the two emplacements; but by the next act, that of March 3, 1905, there was no appropriation made for 12-inch carriages, although one was made

for four 12-inch emplacements; and by the bill which you have before you there is only one 12-inch carriage provided for, although provision is made for four 12-inch emplacements.

Senator ALLISON. You are short seven carriages?

General CROZIER. So, adding those figures, you see I am short seven carriages.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. PERKINS. With pleasure.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very much of the opinion that General Crozier and those in charge are, to use a homely expression, "putting the cart before the horse." I visited your coast from San Diego clear up to Puget Sound. They are putting up emplacements. The guns are lying in the weeds, covered over with oil to keep them from rusting. The great trouble is, they have not men to take care of the guns and the emplacements they have now. There should not be another emplacement or one of these sand pits on these projections into the sea until we have men to take care of the guns and the carriages we have now.

I speak from personal observation of a half a dozen forts. The gun carriages we have are not being employed. They have emplacements where there are no guns and they have guns where they have no emplacements.

Mr. PERKINS. Further answering the Senator from Georgia, I think this is self-explanatory. It is as if we had the running gear of seven wagons, the wheels and axles, and no wagon beds to put on them, and they are therefore useless.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me, they have no men to put the wagon beds on the wagon wheels.

Mr. PERKINS. They have no one to drive the horses. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the recommendations of the joint board. I will only read what they are all agreed on:

The joint board is unanimously of the opinion—

(1) That without a fortified naval base in the Philippines the Asiatic fleet can not keep open the lines of communication for supplies from the United States, or between the Army posts within the Philippines, without which supplies the military forces of the United States could not hold command of the islands.

(2) That Manila is not, but that Subig Bay is, suited for a naval base and station, and of all harbors in the archipelago it is the best for the purpose.

(3) That the fortification of Subig Bay is essential to the security of a naval station located there.

(4) That a fortified naval base at Subig Bay will contribute materially to the defense of Manila Bay.

Then I also desire to read what Admiral Dewey says in a letter to Mr. Foss, chairman of the Naval Committee of the House, dated February 14, 1906, with respect to this very bill:

I thereupon went to Subig Bay and spent considerable time in examining it, particularly as to its fitness for a naval base, and came to the conclusion, which has been strengthened by all my subsequent study, that Olongapo was an ideal natural site for a naval station and immeasurably superior to any location in Manila Bay.

Very truly, yours,

GEORGE DEWEY.

Now, that proves the proposition that it is the uniform opinion of all those best qualified to judge that Olongapo, Subig Bay, is the place for the naval station. It is easily defended and has sufficient water.

Of course when I spoke about Batan and the coal mines I did not suppose we were going to attach a naval station to a coal mine. A naval station must be placed with regard to other considerations. It has been placed there. Eight hundred thousand dollars was the first appropriation for Subig Bay. We have been appropriating money ever since. The work has begun. There is a dock going there now worth a million and a quarter. I repeat my original figures, which I find confirmed by the House debate, that altogether nearly two million dollars and a half has been authorized or spent at Subig Bay. It is also for the defense of Manila. It is admitted that it is the station we shall always hold in those islands.

Now, I submit that it is bad economy to prohibit the War and Navy Departments from spending any money at Subig Bay. Of course the purpose is to throw the expenditure to Cavite, where no money ought to be spent. It never, by any possibility, can be made a good station, because the water is not there.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the chart of Manila Bay.

Mr. LODGE. I have not been there, but I am fairly familiar with the chart.

Mr. PERKINS. I should also like to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to Batan Island.

Mr. LODGE. I know where that is, too.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure we did wisely in purchasing those mines.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. But suppose we find an iron mine, and it is wise to secure it; is it then to be argued that we must move

the naval station over to the iron mine? The naval station is military. It is not merely to be near a coal mine. The object is the military value, and the military value of Subig Bay is admitted by every expert whose opinion is worth anything. In the judgment of the joint board of the Army and the Navy, Subig Bay is the proper place for a naval base. We have already begun to spend money there—

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. ELKINS. If you establish a naval station at Subig Bay, will you not also have to establish one at Manila, and are you in favor of both?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it will be necessary, if we have a strong base at Subig Bay, to enter on very extensive fortifications in Manila Harbor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is only 70 miles away.

Mr. LODGE. It is only 70 miles away, and Manila is such a large bay that the way to protect Manila is with a fleet. The fleet that holds Subig Bay is master of Manila. It may be necessary to have submarine mines in the channel, or something of that kind, but I do not think there is the slightest use of wasting large sums of money in fortifications around Cavite. I think the way to defend Manila Bay is with a powerful fleet. You want a naval station at Subig Bay; you can easily fortify it; and there is where the naval property is and is going to be.

Mr. ELKINS. As I understand it, in order to get to Subig Bay, in order to get deep water, you would have to dredge to a great extent, which would put the Government to great expense.

Mr. LODGE. The facts are exactly the other way. What needs to be done at Subig Bay is to fill in the land for the buildings, because it is now marshy. There is great depth of water in Subig Bay. I am told by naval officers that you can not get a battle ship within 2 miles of Cavite.

Mr. ELKINS. I will ask the Senator from Wyoming, who has been there, if it is not his impression from actual observation that you would have to dredge there in order to get water enough to float a fleet?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to answer, I will say that part of the bay has deep water, but it is a part of the plan of those who advocate Subig Bay as a naval base to dredge more than a mile square, some of it over 20 feet deep.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to call attention to the estimate made by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. It reads as follows:

Toward dredging, filling, and grading, including cost of dredges and necessary tools and equipment (to cost \$1,200,000).

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is to be provided this year. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, with his permission, a question.

Mr. LODGE. I will take the map which the Senator has furnished me, showing the depth of water. There are now 6 fathoms of water right in the harbor of Olongapo. It goes up to it.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no question about that. The only trouble is it is 70 miles from the place we want to fortify.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the Senator allow me to correct him—that is, if the Secretary of War knows anything about it, and I think he does, because he has spent considerable time in the islands. He says it is only 35.

Mr. PERKINS. That must be overland.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean to say it is a shorter distance by land than by water?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts this question, and it is the whole nut of the proposition. If Subig Bay is the place, and I do not controvert it or pretend to say it is not, why did not the Board of Fortifications and Coast Defenses, in submitting their report on February 21, submit a plan to us? They say it is an important port, I will admit, but they make no recommendation as to a plan or how it should be fortified.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask what recommendation they make about Cavite? Have they a plan there?

Mr. PERKINS. Ever since we have had it—

Mr. LODGE. There is no plan for Cavite any more than there is for Subig Bay; but this is a proposition to prohibit any expenditure at Subig Bay and throw the expenditure to Cavite, which, I submit, is a waste of money.



Mr. PERKINS. Admiral Dewey made a plan for the improvement of Manila Bay, and we have been working on those lines ever since.

Mr. LODGE. I am not speaking of improvements to Manila Bay. I am speaking of the fortification of Cavite. They have submitted no plan for that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like—

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. I do. I yield to any Senator.

Mr. TELLER. If I could get the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, or of some other Senator, I should like to ask him a question. If this money is not expended at Subig Bay, where is it going to be expended? Will somebody tell us that?

Mr. LODGE. Where is the money to be expended if not at Subig Bay? is the question the Senator from Colorado asks.

Mr. PERKINS. It is to be expended, in the discretion of the Board of Fortifications, in Manila Bay, in the islands of Corregidor and Cabello, and in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Colorado will see exactly the point of it. It is to deprive them of discretion as to Subig Bay. They have discretion to spend money without any plan at Cavite or Corregidor or any other point in Manila Bay, but they have no discretion as to Subig Bay, which has been taken as a naval station and where we have made large expenditures.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know much about this bill. While I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which reported it, I am not a member of the subcommittee, and unfortunately I did not get any notice of the meeting of the committee and was not present at all.

I do not know what it will cost to do this work, but I understand that the naval people are extremely anxious to do this work at Subig Bay. I understand from the Senator from Massachusetts that two millions and a half have already been expended there. Some one says \$800,000, and that the remainder has been authorized. I should like to know the character of those expenditures, if some one can tell me.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, if he should go there, unless there has been something very materially added in the last few months, would see a part of a wharf; about what would be built at some siding where cord wood is loaded. That is all there is in sight. The money may have been appropriated and may have been properly used, but from the view point of the bay itself there is nothing in sight except a small wooden pier, which runs out a little ways, where small vessels can unload.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator from California, who has this bill in charge, where they propose to expend the money that is to be expended in the Hawaiian Islands? Is there any definite place for that expenditure?

Mr. PERKINS. It will be expended partly in the port of Honolulu and at Pearl Harbor. However, that is a matter which has been agreed upon. The improvement of Pearl Harbor and the fortification of Honolulu have been agreed upon under the plan submitted to our committee, of which the Senator is a member, four years since. But this is a new plan of operation. It is an appropriation of money for which we have no plan, and as the Senator was not present when I read from the reports—

Mr. TELLER. Yes, I was; but I could not hear it over here, with all the noise there is in the Chamber.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to read it again for the benefit of the Senator. It is from the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, an eminent naval officer, the peer of anyone in our Navy or any other navy, and he says what I shall read about Olongapo. The money we appropriated at the last session of Congress, to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred, has not been expended, as I infer from this:

The progress of work at Olongapo has not been as satisfactory as was hoped. In a measure this is due to the great amount of preliminary work required to prepare the site for the proposed station, and to the fact that the appropriations have not been made in accordance with the natural sequence in which the work of building up should be undertaken. Careful estimates have been made of the manner in which money for the building up of Olongapo could be most economically and judiciously expended. Since the land for the site has to be raised from 3 to 5 feet above its present level, the time required to establish a repair station at this place will be between six and seven years; and the estimated cost will be \$4,000,000. This should establish a plant which would have a somewhat better output and better facilities than the present station at Cavite.

What your committee claim is that there is no necessity of spending a part of this money at Subig Bay at this time, as we have machine shops and a naval station at Cavite, and the money should be expended there for fortifying the island of Corregidor and the other island that guards the entrance to the

bay. When the Board of Fortifications and Coast Defenses shall submit to the Congress a plan for the fortification of Subig Bay, I do not believe there is a member of the committee who will gainsay their recommendation; but until that time comes let us spend this money where it can be advantageously used.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator speaks of these naval and Army officers. Why can we not trust to their discretion? Why must we undertake to prohibit the expenditure of this money at a given place, which will simply involve double expenditure in the end?

Mr. TELLER obtained the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. ELKINS (to Mr. ALLISON). Mr. TELLER has the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I beg pardon.

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa, because I want some information. I have not got it, and he may have it. So I hope he will proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not know that I can give the Senate or the Senator the information required. My chief reason for agreeing to this prohibition of expenditure at Subig Bay was that the committee had no information which would justify them in providing for such expenditure. So far as the statements and reports disclose, there is nothing practically now at Subig Bay, and there will be very little at Subig Bay except this great dry dock, and, as is stated in the report from which the Senator from California has just read, it will take from six to seven years to prepare the ground for the naval station. Therefore, it appeared to us that it was premature for us to undertake now or to allow anybody else to undertake to spend money for fortifications at Subig Bay.

Indeed it seems to me that there is no pressing necessity for spending this money anywhere in the Philippines at this time.

Mr. TELLER. That I agree with.

Mr. ALLISON. But there was a small appropriation provided in the bill as it came from the House, to be expended ratably in the Hawaiian Islands, at Pearl Harbor and Honolulu, and a small appropriation for expenditures in the Philippine Islands. The appropriation in the bill is less than half what is desired. I speak now generally, because I only listened to the testimony taken before the committee and to the reading of reports. Now, there is nowhere that I can discover—and if the Senator from Massachusetts has that information and will give it to us, he will throw a great deal of light upon this subject, so far as I am concerned—any estimate or statement which discloses with reasonable accuracy the cost of the new naval station at Subig Bay.

Mr. LODGE. I can inform the Senator, if he cares to be informed.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall be very glad to have it.

Mr. LODGE. I will venture to read the statement of the chairman of the Naval Committee of the House. He said:

Now, there is one other thing I want to say, and that is that all of these estimates which we hear about, of forty million dollars and a hundred million dollars, and all that sort of thing, are brought in here for no other reason than just to make the proposition look ridiculous. I never heard of them until I heard them on this floor. The first proposition was a proposition between twenty and thirty million dollars, and the last proposition was a proposition brought before our committee by Mr. Secretary Moody, when he was Secretary of the Navy, for \$9,000,000, extending over a long period of years. These statements can be verified by referring to the testimony—

Which is in the House hearings. I have not those hearings at hand for the moment. But it has all been laid out, and the \$9,000,000 project was agreed to by the House and by the Naval Committee of the Senate subsequently. I can not put my hands on the hearings at this moment of time, but if the Senate will let it go over, I will find it.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the information I want. The estimate of \$20,000,000 has been reduced, according to the RECORD, from \$20,000,000 to \$9,000,000; and it is a most remarkable fact that so large a reduction can be made in so short a time.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will excuse me, they never adopted the \$20,000,000 proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. LODGE. They adopted the \$9,000,000 project.

Mr. ALLISON. They adopted the modified proposition of \$9,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. They did. That was two years ago.

Mr. ALLISON. That was two years ago.

This is an expenditure for a naval station. Now, before any material expenditure has been made at Subig Bay, they ask us in a fortifications bill to appropriate money which may be expended in the discretion of somebody at Subig Bay. The committee believed, and I believe, that it is not wise for us to authorize the expenditure of money at Subig Bay until we have a larger and better notion of the cost.

Besides that, there is practically nothing there to defend,

and there will be nothing except this dry dock, which will be there, according to the Senator from California, by Christmas.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. I will.

Mr. LODGE. If he will move to strike from the bill all of the appropriation for the fortification of the Philippines, I will vote with him; but what I object to is this attempt to force the expenditure for fortifications in the Philippines into Cavite, where, from my knowledge of the subject (although I have not been fortunate enough to visit the islands, I have studied the subject for a good many years), I believe it will be a dead waste.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say that I am waiting for a good opportunity to move to strike out the words "and the Philippine Islands."

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me a few minutes more I will give him that opportunity.

Mr. TELLER. I do not want to hurry the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that when we had a naval station at Port Royal and were endeavoring to build it up, we found great difficulty in getting any encouragement or help from the Navy Department, because, as they said, Port Royal was nowhere. There was plenty of water there; it was a magnificent harbor, but there was no town, no anything. Therefore, after several years of stepmotherly treatment, we consented to have the harbor at Charleston examined relatively to Port Royal; and the naval station was transferred to Charleston, where there is plenty of water under the jetty system which was established by Congress several years ago.

Now, this Subig Bay programme originally contemplated \$20,000,000. The Naval Committee was so much taken off its feet, so to speak, by the magnitude of that proposition that it felt unwilling to make any move at all, and finally the naval officers or the board modified and brought down their estimates to \$9,000,000. This fortification programme involves, as the Senator from Iowa has just stated, the fortification of a lot of water and nothing else. There is no city there; there is no dock there, except this one that is floating around. We can carry it to Manila Bay just as well as to Subig Bay, if we are going to use it—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me? It is impossible to place the dock at Manila or Cavite, according to the statement of naval officers.

Mr. TILLMAN. It certainly is impossible to place it at Olongapo, because, if the Senator will look at the chart in front of him, he will find that the depth of water is but 12, 13, or 14 feet, and you would have to dredge out the harbor in order to get the dock within a mile of the town.

Mr. ELKINS. It is not that deep.

Mr. TILLMAN. Twelve, 13, or 14 feet. You will have to make a harbor in front of the proposed naval station—

Mr. LODGE. I think you are mistaken.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before you can touch it with anything except the expenditure of money. You can have no dock there.

Mr. LODGE. There are 6 fathoms of water immediately against the town.

Mr. TILLMAN. Six fathoms?

Mr. LODGE. Six fathoms.

Mr. TILLMAN. Eleven feet.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations believed that it was unwise to commence fortifications until we had something to defend, especially so when we have a very large plan of additional fortifications to defend our own coast and a very urgent request for the expenditure of money in that direction.

But there was another reason which operated upon my mind with respect to this matter, and that was that I conceived it to be a matter for the Committee on Naval Affairs to determine, first, whether they intend to establish a naval station there to take the place of the station at Cavite. The Senator from Massachusetts seems to think that Subig Bay or this particular point is the only suitable place for a naval station. If we are to have a naval station there, let us have it under a full knowledge of the cost of it, present and prospective, and when we have commenced the work there and have made a substantial progress in it, if it needs the defense that is required from the Army to fortify that coast, then we can make provision for it.

Mr. LODGE. I entirely agree with that proposition. Strike out the Philippines from the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I will agree with the Senator on that point; we will have no trouble about it if that is his judgment. He is chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, and the islands are largely in his keeping, and if he thinks that ought to be done I shall follow him.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to strike out the whole Philippine Islands from the bill. What I am not willing to do is to prohibit the expenditure of money at the only point where, in my judgment, money ought to be expended.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I will have a word more in answer to that. Perhaps money ought to be expended at Subig Bay, but it ought not to be expended in building fortifications until we have something to defend. Therefore, whatever money is expended at Subig Bay should be expended after a full and careful consideration of the matter by the Committee on Naval Affairs. No better reason can be given for that than the fact that the Senator from California and the Senator from South Carolina, both of whom are members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, have already looked into this matter to a degree which convinces them that we should not fortify Subig Bay, because they are both on the Committee on Appropriations and both voted for this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to emphasize that fact, if the Senator please. The general commanding the Division of the Philippine Islands has not reported in favor of it. His report in 1903 was rather against it. The last report of Major-General Corbin was in 1905, and he has not a word to say about it. He is silent.

Mr. LODGE. I do not suppose he was reporting on a naval station.

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. PERKINS. Reports on fortifications and recommendations for fortifications are under the War Department. When it comes to consider the question under the Navy Department, the Committee on Naval Affairs will try to give it a careful consideration and recommend what they believe to be in the interests of the Navy.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLAY. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that he would be glad to vote in favor of striking from the bill every feature of it that relates to our insular possessions.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, Mr. President, I did not say anything of the kind. I said I would be glad to strike the Philippines out of this paragraph, and I hope it will be done.

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. LODGE. What I am trying to prevent is forcing the Government to waste money at Cavite. That is what I am trying to prevent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. With all this talk of the waste of money it is not proposed to spend one dollar of this appropriation at Cavite except that expending it at the mouth of Manila Bay and protecting Manila will, incidentally, of course, protect Cavite.

Mr. LODGE. Anyone who will look at the map will see that Cavite is not the place to protect Manila Bay.

Mr. WARREN. It is not claimed that it is, but the narrow entrance to Manila Bay, of course, is to be protected by proper fortifications.

Mr. LODGE (indicating on the map). Cavite is in there. The entrance to the bay is out there.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TELLER. I have yielded to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY], and he has the floor.

Mr. CLAY. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that he is in favor of striking out of the bill everything that relates to our insular possessions.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; the Senator could not have understood me to say that, and he knows I never did say it.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator says I misunderstood him. I was going to ask the Senator, if he did say that, how he had reached the conclusion that it was not necessary for us to fortify in order to defend the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LODGE. It is not necessary for me to explain a statement I did not make.



Mr. CLAY. Then I understand the Senator to say that he is in favor of striking from the bill everything that has reference to seacoast batteries in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LODGE. I never said it, or anything resembling it.

Mr. CLAY. Then the Senator did say he is in favor of striking from the bill lines 5, 6, 7, and 8?

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President, I did not say that.

Mr. CLAY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. LODGE. I said I was in favor of striking out all of this paragraph that relates to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CLAY. The paragraph reads as follows:

For construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, \$600,000.

Mr. LODGE. That is not striking out the Philippines.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator did say he is in favor of striking out everything in the paragraph that relates to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LODGE. I did, and I repeat it.

Mr. CLAY. Does the Senator admit, then, that it would leave it in this shape, that the appropriation of \$600,000 shall be applied to the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; and the appropriation can be well applied to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. CLAY. Does the Senator have any idea how much money it would take to perfect our coast defenses in the Philippine Islands? Has he any idea how much money we will have to spend there in order to get through with this work? I see that this bill carries \$5,000,000, and two-thirds of this vast sum is to go to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LODGE. I am not upon the Committee on Appropriations. I have no doubt the Senator from California, who is very familiar with this subject, can tell the Senator in one moment what will be required to fortify the Philippines. But I can not do it, as the fortifications are not within the province of the Philippines Committee. I am only protesting here against what I believe will be a wasteful expenditure of the public money. If money is to be spent for fortifications it ought not to be spent at Cavite. Of that I am satisfied.

Mr. CLAY. I agree with the Senator in regard to that.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator aware of the fact I state that there is no fortification intended at Cavite, but at the entrance to the bay? Cavite is situated in one part of the bay and Manila at another, and you can not protect Manila without incidentally protecting Cavite. The fortifications are at the mouth of the bay.

Mr. LODGE. If this money is to be spent in the Philippine Islands for fortifications it is to be spent either at Subig Bay or at Manila Bay, or in both places.

Mr. CLAY. Why does the Senator—

Mr. LODGE. If you prohibit its being spent at Subig Bay, it must be spent for the defense of Cavite and Manila. There is no plan for that any more than there is for Subig Bay. I think we had better let the whole thing go rather than put in this prohibition.

Mr. CLAY. Why does the Senator say the money must be spent at the places designated by himself? If the amendment in lines 6 and 7 is stricken out would it not be spent in the discretion of the War Department anywhere they might choose?

Mr. LODGE. I am speaking of the bill as it stands, not of the bill as it will be.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Scott] asked me to yield to him. I will yield to him now if he desires.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I think before we commence to spend money either at Subig Bay or in the Hawaiian Islands, or at any other place further than is now under contract, we first should provide men to take care of the work. If the Senate does not intend to support a bill that has been sent to the Committee on Military Affairs by the War Department increasing the Coast Artillery 10,000 men, in my judgment every dollar that we appropriate for additional fortifications and in spending money for these very expensive guns is money very illy appropriated, and certainly wasteful, because they are not being taken care of. As I said a moment ago, there are fortifications and emplacements where you have no guns. There are other places where you have guns and you have no fortifications, and you have no men to take care of them. At other places you have carriages and other munitions of war that are going to waste because they are not properly cared for. Unless you are going to increase the Coast Artillery, in my judgment you might just as well save the money that it is proposed to appropriate for these additional fortifications and emplacements.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think this condition is rather unusual. We are here with a bill under which some Senators think we ought to spend money in one place and others in another. There is, I understand, no detailed plan that anybody

can depend upon as to the character of the expenditure at Subig Bay.

As stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, \$20,000,000 were suggested. Nobody who listened to that suggestion had any idea that \$20,000,000 would complete what the naval people wanted. But suddenly, when they found that that was not acceptable, they dropped it to \$9,000,000. Of course, we understood they would go on with the \$9,000,000 if they got it. They would make some kind of an arrangement for the fortification and defense of that harbor; and later we would be called upon to make a further expenditure, and nobody knows how much that expenditure would be.

I think the mistake the committee made was that they did not strike out all about the Philippine Islands in the beginning, that they did not confine themselves to the harbor and fortifications of the place they have some knowledge of, and that, of course, is Pearl Harbor, and not the Philippine Islands. I was not present at the hearing nor when the conclusion was reached. I am not able to say whether the \$600,000 now would be properly applied in the Hawaiian Islands or not, but I have discovered that no matter how large you make the appropriation for these coast and harbor defenses you will never have enough; there will always be a cry for more. So, I have no doubt, if we should strike out the word "Philippines" here and leave it an appropriation for the Hawaiian Islands alone, that money would be expended as other money is expended. Whether it will be enough to complete the work there or not I do not know, but I should presume not.

Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think we should enter upon a series of experiments in the Philippine Islands; that is to say, I do not think we should commence on this harbor and then on the other harbor, putting money here and money there. I think Congress should have a definite and determined plan. If we are going to expend money in the Philippine Islands, we should select some place which is the best place to spend our money, where we will get the most possible for it. And I want to guarantee now that you will not get very much from the expenditure, whichever harbor or whichever bay you select. But there should be some determinate plan. We can not possibly fortify all the harbors.

Now, what is the necessity of our fortifying any harbor in the Philippine Islands? If we have a foreign war, we shall defend them entirely, if we attempt to protect the Philippine Islands, with our Navy; and if we fail with the Navy, we shall fail no matter how much money we put on fortifications.

The recent developments of modern warfare have shown that it is beyond the possibility of man's genius to create fortifications that the modern guns can not destroy. It was said before the Russian and Japanese war that Port Arthur could be defended against the combined fleets of the world. It probably was the strongest place in the world, so far as artificial means were concerned; and yet it went down before a second-class nation's fleet. If we ever have a war that will require fortifications in the Philippine Islands, we will require such fortifications as will take not \$20,000,000, or \$200,000,000, but \$500,000,000. We may make some defense of those islands with our ships, but we shall find that if we are ever met by a war with any nation on earth that has got a fleet, little or great, every man in the United States will wish that before the islands came to us they had disappeared from the sight of man.

Mr. President, they are an encumbrance upon us. I should like to have somebody tell me how much money we have expended in the seven or eight years that we have been dealing with those islands. You can not get any reliable statement from any official of the Government. Nobody wants to say what it has cost. Very few men could show the amount if they should try. I remember that as much as three years ago the then senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar, declared on the floor of the Senate, after a careful and detailed statement, that more than \$600,000,000 had then been expended. Within two months afterwards the senior senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] declared on this floor that he had made a calculation, the best that he could get, and \$650,000,000 had been expended. Two years ago and more a distinguished statistician of Massachusetts, a friendly statistician, a man friendly to the Administration now in power, declared that we had expended in the Philippine Islands \$800,000,000.

Mr. President, we have spent a great deal of money there. We have got practically nothing back, as everybody knows. Our trade, if every dollar of it was profit, would not begin to compensate us for the expenditures of the last year, let alone the numerous years before. We do buy a little of them, and we sell a very little to them. I hope the time will come when we shall be rid of the Philippine Islands. I hope the time is not far distant when the American people will conclude that it is

not the province of a nation like ours to attempt the civilization of any other country perforce.

In the whole history of the world there is no instance where a nation outside of another has been able to elevate them in civilization and in morals. I deny that any Senator can show me a single instance where civilization has not come from the inside and never where it has come from the outside. In making this statement not long ago a Senator said to me: "I will point to you India." The civilization of India, with nearly two hundred years of English administration, is not one whit better to-day, except in a few particulars, than it was nearly two hundred years ago.

#### REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have made inquiry, and I find no one who is ready to go on with the discussion of the rate bill this morning, though we have promise of a good many speeches to-morrow and the next day. I therefore ask that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily in order that the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill may be completed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. Lodge, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. MORGAN were appointed.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 15744. An act to abolish the office of Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 15848. An act authorizing the sale of timber on the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation for the benefit of the Indians belonging thereto was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution extending the time for opening to public entry the unallotted lands on the ceded portion of the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in Wyoming, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14171) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss the Philippine question, whether we ought to hold the islands, or whether we ought to abandon them, and I will not take the time of the Senate further on that question. I simply want to move now to strike out of line 6, page 8, the words "and Philippine Islands," leaving the appropriation, unless some one chooses to move to reduce it, of \$600,000 to go to the Hawaiian Islands. I think it must be apparent that we are not in a condition to determine whether we ought to put this money on Subig Bay or on Manila Bay. That leaves it entirely to be spent on the Hawaiian Islands. I understood some Senators on the other side to say it could be profitably and properly expended under present conditions at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in his desire to get rid of the Philippine Islands, and I hardly think this is the time, on the fortifications appropriation bill, to discuss a question so broad and of so much importance. The fact is, I think the Philippine Islands, as we have them, will prove of great advantage to the United States. I think they furnish a base for operations in the East, where we must extend our commerce and protect

American interests. Relatively, our trade and commerce with the Orient is destined to be more important than with Europe.

It does not belong to Anglo-Saxon blood to give up land under any circumstances. I never knew a man who had land so poor that he would give it up or allow somebody to take it for nothing. I have never known the Anglo-Saxons as a nation in any part of the world to give up land once conquered or acquired.

I do not see why the proposition is so frequently brought into this Chamber to surrender the Philippine Islands, which I consider valuable possessions in the East. Give them up? Surrender to whom, how, when, and for what? I think the Philippine Islands are, as I said, necessary to the establishment and expansion of our commerce, and I think they will never be given up or surrendered by the United States any more than Porto Rico, or Cuba if we had it, or any other island or any other land; any more than we would give up Arizona, New Mexico, or any part of our national domain. The Philippine Islands constitute a part or portion of the territory of the United States.

It does not belong to American policy and the American mind to give up real estate—land situate anywhere the flag floats on this globe. Territory is becoming limited, anyway. There are few places not occupied. The United States, by the fortunes of war, finds itself in possession of the Philippines, and I hope it will keep them not only now, but for all time, and I believe it will. I don't believe the time will ever come when the people will give up the Philippine Islands.

Now, Mr. President, coming to this amendment, the Committee on Appropriations had hearings and gave the subject very careful consideration. The chief objection to appropriating this sum of money was that the undertaking would involve the expenditure of very large sums of money—some said \$40,000,000, some said \$50,000,000, and others got it down as low as \$9,000,000. Before beginning operations of this magnitude we should have ample time to find a suitable and the best place to fortify, if we are going to fortify at all. I do not see any pressing necessity for fortifying just now. I do not know of any nation that wants to take the islands away from us. If they do, they will find at least half of this Chamber on the other side ready to give them up without fortifying them.

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator he would find it very difficult to find any nation to take them, if offered as a gift.

Mr. ELKINS. I am glad of that, but I find that a part of the Senate thinks they would be willing to give them up. But I hardly think we will give them up.

Mr. President, the sum involved here is only \$600,000, and it is to be distributed to other portions of our possessions. Some of it goes to Honolulu. I have looked at this chart, and unquestionably, if I am right, for a mile out from land at Olongapo the water is in places only a fourth of a fathom and half a fathom and one and a quarter fathoms deep. Out about a mile the water begins to be six fathoms. Farther out it is twelve, seventeen, and nineteen fathoms.

We should not begin operations on this scale—great improvements, permanent, and to last forever—without some definite knowledge, and surely not at a place that will require a mile of excavation before you can get to the mainland.

Mr. LODGE. At Cavite?

Mr. ELKINS. I am not for Cavite any more than I am for this place just now. I think we need more light on the subject.

Mr. LODGE. That is right.

Mr. ELKINS. If the great party that seems so eager to give up the Philippine Islands should succeed, unfortunately for the country, at the next election or the election thereafter, and give them up, we will save the money by not making this appropriation, and the country we cede them to will not have the fortifications.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to make the suggestion to the Senator that if he desires to assist the Democratic party in the next election I hope he will persuade the people that they are in favor of giving up the Philippines.

Mr. ELKINS. The Democratic party?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not think when you come to test it squarely, although there is a great deal of talk in this Chamber, that the Democratic party will commit itself to any such policy. I think the Democrats have a good deal of human nature in them. They are of just about the same blood as the Republicans, and when it comes to giving up anything for nothing or to persuading somebody to take our property for nothing, they will be found about as far from doing it as Republicans are. I do not think, when it comes to the test, the Democratic party will give up the Philippines under any circumstances, especially without a consideration, and I do not believe the Democratic party will put a surrender or give-up plank in their next platform. If they should, the Republican



party is willing and will meet them on that issue, as it has met them upon other great issues before the people.

Mr. TELLER. That is, they will put it in their platform, too, I suppose.

Mr. ELKINS. The Republicans will declare and say they will never surrender our possessions and give them up for nothing, possessions that have cost us money and blood.

Mr. TELLER. And that have cost us a good deal of money.

Mr. ELKINS. And a good deal of blood.

Mr. President, I hope the committee will be sustained in the position it has taken.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have no wish to discuss general Philippine policy or politics at the present time. We have before us a fortifications appropriation bill, not for making naval appropriations, but for making appropriations to fortify various harbors and places throughout the United States and its insular possessions.

Subig Bay, or Olongapo, as it is called, contains nothing now to defend. According to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I take it for granted he is correct, there have been appropriations of a million or two made, and they are yet unexpended, as everyone knows who has visited the place. So there is no necessity at this time for appropriating any money for fortifying Subig Bay, because they have not expended what they have already in hand and there is nothing in the bay calling for defense.

It is unnecessary to appropriate now, because there is nothing there to protect. It would be foolish indeed to take any portion of the \$600,000, that small amount, and use it at Subig Bay at the present time when the money is so much needed at other places where we have something to protect—the Hawaiian Islands, Manila Bay, and possibly other points. If the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to leave Manila Bay, and thus the city of Manila and Cavite, without fortifications, and his amendment should carry, the responsibility will have to be with him and those who think with him.

When that Senator or any Senator claims that Subig Bay protects Manila, then he might, with equal justice, claim that Boston Harbor protects Washington, and we might as well roll the guns we have along the Potomac down into the river.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure the Senator does not mean to misquote me. I said the fleet would protect Manila, and if Manila had any other protection than Subig Bay, it would necessarily be the fleet.

Mr. WARREN. Then, does the Senator say that he does not want to fortify the entrance of Manila Bay?

Mr. LODGE. We have no plan for fortifying either place. We could use torpedoes and guns at the opening of Manila Bay.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Massachusetts ought not to deceive himself or others. It is not a matter of guns, etc., at Manila and Cavite. It is the entrance of the bay, where there is narrow deep water, with the banks high on each side and with the Corregidor Islands in the channel, through which every vessel must go to reach Cavite or Manila, 15 or 20 miles away. When you have fortified that bay you have fortified about all there is at present in the Philippine Islands in the way of property interests, or at least you have the key to the Philippines. When you fortify Subig Bay you fortify a sheet of water that has as yet practically nothing in it, surrounded by a country that is nearly as wild as this country was before Christopher Columbus discovered it. There is nothing there. I am not inveighing against Subig Bay as a place for a great naval base in time, but it is unnecessary to appropriate at this time when it will take four or five years to prepare the ground, do the dredging, etc., ready for building. It is unnecessary now to erect fortifications and provide in this bill—which is for fortifications alone—a sum to fortify Subig Bay.

Senators talk about \$9,000,000, and about \$18,000,000; and in another place certain members talked about \$100,000,000; and it was stated, I think by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], that \$4,000,000 or more would be required to prepare the land. With all that uncertainty is it not best for this Senate to have some kind of a base to work upon in the way of estimates before we take a little pickayunish matter of \$600,000, needed elsewhere, and divide it up and use a portion of it for defending that naked sheet of water, with nothing in sight or nothing of consequence within 70 miles of it?

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator from Wyoming ever landed at Olongapo, or has he ever been in Olongapo?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that there is a small town there and that it is not an absolute wilderness, as the Senator has stated. The statement is that there is a town there with 1,200 inhabitants.

Mr. WARREN. I think that is a mistake. I have not landed

there, but in sailing in and about the bay there is not a thing in sight. People in Manila, officers of the Navy and Army, who have been there and who are charged with the responsibility of it make the statement that every hut, building, and shop must be put up there anew; and it has seemed to us that it is the part of wisdom not to follow the proposition with works of defense just now.

Now, as to Cavite, we have a very considerable navy-yard that cost four or five million dollars; we have several hundreds or thousands of men employed there who have homes in the city of Cavite; and we can get along very well there until such time as Congress may, first, ascertain what we need; second, what it will cost; and then, third, appropriate that sum accordingly. We are in no immediate necessity for an additional naval base. Suppose for the present we continue the use of Cavite, although it may not be as good as what might be made at Subig Bay.

I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, when the proper time comes, if Subig is determined to be the proper place to make a great naval port or base, I shall be very glad to join with others; but it is the business of the Navy to provide, first, something for us to defend before we erect fortification works. So far they are at odds; they do not agree. There are two sides to the matter. They are hesitating there whether or not they will spend the money we have already appropriated. Then why shall we, in an appropriation bill intended for fortifications alone, jump in and fortify some wild place, when it will be, according to the best calculations here, from three to ten years before there is a single structure to defend?

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will not prevail, because there is no question but what we ought to fortify the entrance to Manila Bay. It is idle to say because we fortify New York that Baltimore is fortified, or because we fortify Boston, a few hundred miles away, that Washington is fortified.

It does not matter what we do at Subig Bay or when we do it, we must expend some money at the mouth of Manila Bay just the same; and this \$600,000, which can be divided between the Hawaiian Islands and the mouth of Manila Bay, will not give them more than they need, nor as much; and this is all for which this bill for this one year provides and all we need to now consider. If anything is necessary at Subig Bay, and if they want an appropriation later and can tell us anything about it, I will very cheerfully vote in favor of whatever sum it may be, even if it be \$6,000,000 instead of \$600,000; but I hope the present bill will stand as the committee reported it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say that there are no more plans for the fortification of Manila Bay than there are for the fortification of Subig Bay. We are just as much in the dark, so far as plans go, about one place as about the other.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator make that statement as a matter of definite knowledge?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I understand to the contrary. I understand the plans are in the Philippine Islands for fortifying Manila Bay.

Mr. TELLER. The plans may be in the Philippines.

Mr. LODGE. But they are not here.

Mr. TELLER. We have not the plans.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. TELLER. I have never seen them.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, is it possible we are called upon to make appropriations for the erection of fortifications in the Philippines or anywhere else upon estimates made in the absence of plans for the work?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is likewise true as to Subig Bay, Cavite, and Manila Bay. I do not think there are plans for either of the places, so far as Congress knows anything about it.

Mr. SPOONER. Then why should those be dealt with at all?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think they ought to be. I think it is better not to make an appropriation for seacoast fortifications in the Philippines at this time. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. I think that is the wise and prudent thing to do.

I want to read in that connection, as showing the condition of the question, from Secretary Taft's testimony before the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman:

Senator HALE. I do not want to take much of your time as to details, but which do you think is the better place for a naval station as a base of operation if we maintain our possession there for a good many years?

Secretary TAFT. Well, were we to leave the islands, Olongapo is of course—I think everybody will admit—where the naval station ought to be retained. Cavite in many respects is more convenient, labor can be obtained there more easily, and it is more convenient to Manila, which is the source of supply in the islands, and Cavite is the place where we already have a naval arsenal. The difficulty about Cavite, however, is the insufficient depth of water and the limited territory

which could be occupied for a naval station. Now, the dry dock *Dewey*, which is on its way to Manila, or to the Philippines rather, can only be placed at Olongapo; it can not be taken to Cavite, because the water is so shallow that it could not be used there.

Then this question was asked by the Senator from Connecticut:

Senator BRANDEGEE. Is it not true that the Spaniards always had in contemplation the Olongapo station as their principal base?

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir; there is great controversy going on—for this matter is deemed of importance—between professional authorities in the Navy and in the Army as to whether Olongapo is the best place from a strategic point of view. Admiral Dewey and others of the Navy Department feel that as long as there is a fleet in Olongapo no foreign enemy would venture to go into Manila, because it is supposed that they would regard it as a trap. On the other hand, Admiral Folger and General Wood, and I believe General Corbin, have been of the opinion that Manila, because we have military forces there and because it is near Cavite, makes Cavite the more convenient place. The objection to Cavite, as I have already said, is the insufficient territory available for the Government there and the very shallow water off the shore.

There is a dispute among the naval and military authorities, who, I think, probably would like us to expend great sums of money on all these places; but there are no plans before Congress for either of the places, so far as I am aware or have been able to discover. I think, under those circumstances, the best way is to strike the words "and Philippine Islands" out of this paragraph, as the Senator from Colorado suggests.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will prevail. It may be true that the time has not come to make appropriations for the fortification of Subig Bay, but I am very strongly of the opinion that the time will never come when we ought to make appropriations for the fortification of Cavite; and for the purpose of preventing an unfortunate expenditure of money there, I am in favor of striking it out altogether. Cavite can never be made a proper place as a naval or a coaling station, because the natural conditions forbid it. It is not simply the fact of its shallow water, but there is no harbor there, and there never can be a harbor there unless we build a sea wall, at an immense expense, and in that way protect it from the open sea, which lies in front.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is informed as to Cavite. He says it needs the protection of a sea wall; but I ask the Senator if it will not take exactly the same in Subig Bay? We have already spent considerable money at Manila; a sea wall has been built, dredging has been done; and it can be done at Cavite, and Cavite can be made a good harbor. Sea wall and dredging will be necessary at Subig Bay. I am not advocating that, and I am not inveighing against Subig Bay. It is well, however, to note, as we go along, that Cavite can be made a good harbor, just the same as Subig Bay can. It is only a matter of the same expenditure or even less.

Mr. BACON. I do not know how far what the Senator says about Subig Bay may be correct, but if it has the same physical conditions as Cavite I think the criticisms upon it are well founded. To give an illustration of how shallow that water is, I will state that after the battle of Manila Bay, when a number of small vessels were sunk, so far as I am informed, not a single one of them was of sufficient depth to disappear from sight. They were small vessels, and although they were, in technical parlance, sunk, they still remained out of water—even the smallest of them. The largest vessel engaged on the side of the Spaniards, I think, was only 2,500 gross tons, and that was almost as high out of the water after it was sunk as when it was afloat. A number of the smaller vessels were still apparent above the water, and these were miles out from the shore. It opens upon a bay twenty-odd miles in width, and when the wind blows it is just the same as on the seashore. There is no protection for vessels. If that be true of Subig Bay also, then neither one of them ought to be utilized for these purposes. But I will state that my information has always been to the contrary; that, while there is a port at Subig Bay that needs to be dredged, there are other ports that have deep water, and which have the advantage of being protected by a harbor, which Cavite has not.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is it not a fact that the Spaniards had selected Subig Bay as a point for a naval station and had made considerable expenditure of money there?

Mr. BACON. I have no definite knowledge on that subject.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. FRYE. That is my understanding, and I think that appeared before the Commission at Paris.

Mr. BACON. I never before heard the matter questioned about Subig Bay being a proper place.

Mr. LODGE. Admiral Dewey looked in to see if there was a fleet there.

Mr. BACON. I think, in view of the fact stated, that the best way is to strike out that clause until we get definite information and have plans of the fortifications, so as to act intelligently and safely in what we do.

Mr. LODGE. Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention to a paper that came in with the President's message, which was transmitted to Congress on the 5th of March, 1906, which is fairly recent; and at the close of that report, signed by the Secretary of War, the Lieutenant-General of the Army, and others, they say:

Among the places recommended to be defended, the following, in the order named, are considered of special importance: Entrance to Chesapeake Bay, eastern entrance to Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, Subig Bay, Guantanamo, and entrance to Manila Bay.

That is signed by Secretary Taft, General Chaffee, General Bates, Rear-Admiral Thomas, General Story, General Greeley, General Crozier, General Mackenzie, General Mills, and Captain Sperry of the Navy.

In a communication of February 1, 1906, containing a list of the ports, they include Subig Bay among the ports of first importance, and Manila Bay among the ports of secondary importance.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. That report was favorable to fortifying Manila Bay. The Senator differs slightly with the position he took earlier this morning, in which he said there was no need of fortifications at Manila Bay.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say it needed no fortifications. I said it would be a waste of money to spend it at Cavite.

Mr. WARREN. And I have said several times—perhaps the Senator may not have noticed it—that there is no intention and has not been any intention of appropriating any money in the fortifications bill to be expended at Cavite.

Mr. LODGE. So far as Manila Bay is concerned, we have no plans. They admit it is of secondary importance. In our present state of knowledge, it seems to me the wise and prudent thing to do is to strike out the words "and Philippines," and disagree to the committee amendment.

Mr. PERKINS rose.

Mr. LODGE. I hope, Mr. President, that the committee amendment will be passed over, as it is entirely dependent upon the action on the other amendments.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that the pending question is a disagreement with the committee amendment.

Mr. WARREN. No; on the amendment to strike out the words "and Philippines."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee. Under the agreement, the committee amendments are first to be considered.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And then later on, as I understand, after the committee amendments are disposed of, an amendment will be offered to strike out of this bill all items relating to fortifications in the Philippines?

#### DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION AFFECTING MARKETS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask consent at this time to submit a conference report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10129) to amend section 5501 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 9, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an



amendment as follows: On page 2, line 14, after the word "thereof," insert "and every Member of Congress;" and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference is in some doubt as to its authority to insert this amendment, but believing that the object and purpose of the bill will not be completely effected without it, recommends the insertion of the amendment, and asks the judgment of the two Houses thereon.

C. D. CLARK,  
KNUTE NELSON,  
C. A. CULBERSON,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

JOHN J. JENKINS,  
C. E. LITTLEFIELD,  
H. D. CLAYTON,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator who submits the report would tell us something about it, especially after the question of order which the report itself suggests.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will say to the Senator from Colorado the question of order in the report is this: The bill as passed both Houses provides a punishment for the disclosure of knowledge and for speculation in matters affected by that knowledge which has been acquired in an official capacity. It was discovered by the conferees that Members of Congress in either House were not included. It was further ascertained that judicial decisions have held time and again that Members of Congress are not officers of the United States, but are officers of the State governments. Therefore, while doubting their real power as a conference committee to insert this provision, they thought the objects and purposes of the bill clearly demanded such a provision, so they inserted "and Members of Congress," and ask the judgment of the two Houses upon that amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have no objection to "Members of Congress" being included, but I do object to its being put in the conference report. I object to letting down the rule, which has prevailed ever since we have had a Government, that a conference report should not contain any new legislation. This is absolutely new legislation, and to it I raise the point of order. If the Senator will get this matter up in a separate bill, I will be willing to vote for it, but I am not willing to yield this point now and make a precedent of this kind.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There was no purpose on the part of the conference committee to usurp any authority. I think probably it is the first time that a conference committee has come before this body with a suggestion that perhaps they had not the authority to do a certain thing and submitted the question to the Senate. I submit to the Senator from Colorado, however, that in a matter of this kind, where an order is made sustaining or refusing to sustain a conference committee, it is done by the Senate itself, and that the same rule prevails in another body, where the simple suggestion of new legislation rejects a conference report. All that the conferees desire is the judgment of the Senate upon that point.

Mr. SPOONER. Let me ask the Senator what was the language in difference between the two Houses?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There was no language in difference between the two Houses that would call for this amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. Then the Senator confesses this is entirely usurpatory?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; I do not confess that.

Mr. SPOONER. It is either properly there or improperly there.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That may be, but one can not always tell what is proper or what is improper. The committee say in their report, as the Senator would have known if he had listened, that it is in doubt as to its authority in this matter, and submits it to the two Houses.

Mr. SPOONER. I am simply trying to elicit information, if I can, from the Senator to enable me to form some judgment, for one, as to whether the committee was right or wrong. It is impossible to do that unless one can know what the conference was upon and what was the difference between the two Houses. The Senate amended the bill. It did not concur, of course, in the bill as it came from the House, or there would have been no conference.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does the Senator ask for all the differences between the two bodies?

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to know what was the proposition in difference between the two Houses upon which the

conference committee ingrafted this provision as to Members of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I can not say that there was any.

Mr. KEAN. Then, how did the bill get in conference?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, there were differences on the bill itself.

Mr. KEAN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There were various differences on the bill. There were ten or twelve amendments which the Senate made to the House bill.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will pardon me, were they differences as to the persons upon whom the bill, if enacted, would be operative? In other words, is there any pretext even on which there was jurisdiction in the committee to apply this proposition to Members of Congress?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator puts a square question so squarely that it is almost impossible to answer it. The conference committee supposed that the purpose of both Houses was to prevent these things being done by any officer of the United States Government. They also supposed that both Houses understood at the time they passed the bill that it would probably refer to Members of Congress, who have now and then been charged with such offenses.

Mr. SPOONER. Ought it not to include them? Why should it not technically? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think it should, but the conference committee has referred it to the Senate and House of Representatives to say whether they want to include the provision in this way.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to withdraw the point of order in this case. The controversy arises on the second section of the bill, which prohibits, under penalty, officers or employees of the Government of the United States speculating on facts which come to their knowledge by virtue of their offices. It was a question—and there is possibility of some doubt on the question—as to whether the general terms used include members of the two Houses of Congress. The committee of conference, of which I happened to be one, assuming, for the sake of the argument, that members of Congress are not included, have frankly presented the matter to the Senate and to the House of Representatives and submitted it to their judgment.

If his bill passes without including members of Congress we will have the anomalous condition—a condition that ought not to exist—of all officers of the United States Government, all employees of the United States Government, and all persons who may acquire knowledge by virtue of their relationship to the Government of the United States prohibited from such conduct, except members of the two Houses of Congress. It is an exception, Mr. President, that ought not to exist, an exception that ought not to arise; and, in order that it may not exist, I again appeal to the Senator from Colorado to withdraw his point of order, and let us perfect this legislation in the way submitted by the committee.

It is not an attempt on the part of the committee to sneak in any surreptitious way legislation through the two Houses; but it is an honest attempt, a sincere attempt, a frank attempt on the part of the conference committee to round out and complete legislation which ought to be upon the statute book. I submit to the Senator from Colorado that an objection on his part will prevent the completeness of legislation of this character—legislation which, under the peculiar circumstances surrounding us now, ought to be on the statute book.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I express my surprise at the appeal of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. His argument is based upon the theory that whatever we want to do we can do. That is all there is of it.

If it is necessary or desirable to include in the principles of this proposed law Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, it must be done according to law; and there is no question that it can be done by practically the unanimous vote of this body.

It is not a question whether you are going to round out the law; it is a question whether you are going to enact laws in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. There is no authority, Mr. President, here or anywhere else, for a conference committee to legislate and incorporate in a conference report that which neither of the bodies has ever considered.

Does the Senator from Texas think for a moment that that can be done now and a precedent created that will not be repeated again and again until we shall surrender the right of legislation to a conference committee—a conference committee appointed frequently against the judgment both of the Senate and of the House, a conference committee not infrequently appointed to exercise powers that are great enough, without giv-

ing them the power to incorporate new legislation into a bill which they are considering?

We know, Mr. President, that many a bill has become a law because a conference committee conceded what this body or the other had declared ought not to be conceded, and we have been powerless here. We shall not be powerless while I have a voice on the floor of the Senate, if it comes by my withdrawing my point of order. I propose to stand by it. I propose to stand by it, but not because I object to including Senators and Representatives. If that had been the proposition on the floor, I would have voted for it, although I know that a Senator is not an officer of the United States, nor is a Member, and I know also that there might be some question exactly as to how it ought to be done and why it should be done. But I do know that this body has no right to accept from the committee legislation that has not been considered in either body.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee knows that when he comes here and tells us practically that there is not any authority for it, but that there is a necessity. Mr. President, I regret to hear in this body a statement that there is a necessity which requires us to violate the fundamental principles of law, and principles, too, which are absolutely necessary for the safety of the minority of every public body dealing with these questions. I shall not withdraw my objection, Mr. President. There is not a Senator here who does not know that the law is against the procedure which is proposed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado says that this method would be in violation of the Constitution of the United States. If I thought that, or if the Senator can point out in what respect this method is in violation of the Constitution of the United States, if it amounted to anything, I would withdraw my appeal. I understand it is merely a violation of the rule of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is not a violation of the rule?

Mr. TELLER. It is a violation of the rules and a violation of the Constitution both.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not so understand the latter; and as I said, if I thought so, or if the Senator from Colorado could point out to me wherein it did, I would withdraw the appeal. I think I am amenable to reason upon the subject; and, of course, in view of what the Senator has said, I do not suggest any further the withdrawal of the point of order.

But, Mr. President, this is no attempt on the part of a conference committee to pass legislation without the consideration of the two Houses of Congress. As the Senator will remember, the committee pointedly and expressly submits this matter to the two Houses of Congress for their consideration. That is the language of the report. Of course the Senate may, upon presentation and consideration of the subject, decline to approve this action of the committee; or if any member of the Senate, for whatever reason, objects I accept his objection without qualification and without reference to what reason he may have for it, according to him the same motive that actuated the committee in that respect. But, Mr. President, at the same time, in justice to the committee, it ought to be reiterated that the committee has expressly submitted this matter for the consideration and action of the Senate as a body, admitting that it is probably in violation of the rules of the Senate. However, so far as I know, it never occurred to any member of the committee that it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States.

I have no feeling about the matter, Mr. President—none in the world; but I did say, and I have no hesitation in repeating in my place in this body, that it would be unfortunate if we should knowingly, and after the matter had been called to our attention, pass a law on this subject which would include every official who may have knowledge upon subjects of this character, by virtue of his relationship to the Government of the United States, except members of either House of Congress. While I do not expect to go into that matter in any further detail, I repeat that there is reason for the amendment; and I understand the Senator from Colorado to say that he would not object to an independent and separate measure carrying out the recommendations of the committee in respect to this matter, if it came in regularly from the committee to which it was referred and was submitted in the regular manner to this body. That being true, I thought that possibly, in order to complete this legislation at this session and in this bill, we might waive the rule which requires a conference committee to act only upon such matters as there was a difference upon between the two Houses and upon matters which had passed one or the other House. That is all the reason I have for having said as much as I have upon the matter.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there are but two words in

the amendment, I think. It is not the importance of the words, either, that makes me object to the amendment, as they call it; but if the conference committee are authorized to put in these words, they are authorized to put in any other words they desire, whenever it shall appear to the members of the committee that it would be a wise and judicious and proper thing to do. What I want the Senator from Texas to understand is that he is enacting a law. It is true that there is not much of it, but the principle is the same as if it contained half a dozen pages; and if you can do that, you can enact a law that has never been considered by either branch of the National Legislature, has not been read the first time, the second time, or the third time, and upon which there has been no discussion. Does the Senator from Texas think we should destroy that principle of constitutional law that a bill must be read and must be voted on here simply because, forsooth, somebody may say the Senate and the House ex industria left themselves out of a penal statute?

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am now ready to vote for a resolution—a joint resolution, a measure that has the force of law, or a statute, or in any other way—carrying out the purpose of this amendment, but I am not in favor of creating here a precedent or admitting that under any press of circumstances, no matter how great, we will relax the rule that legislation shall come to us as the Constitution of the United States provides it shall and in no other way.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Colorado will not withdraw his point of order, because, while I sympathize with the Senator from Texas and feel that it is unfortunate that these words "including Representatives and Senators" were not put in, I wish to call his attention to something that happened in this body some seven or eight years ago under similar circumstances, except that the committee of conference were not open, and I thought were not clean. I used the word "clean" once before in regard to their action. It was a sneaky, dirty trick which was played by some one; I do not know by whom.

But in a conference report a provision was sneaked in and went through here—it was never considered or read in the Senate—authorizing the Attorney-General to sue the State of South Carolina on some old Indian bonds. That shows the importance of not allowing a conference committee to legislate, no matter how much needed the legislation may be. It is no trouble to have a law amended. The President notified us the other day in regard to a joint resolution of inquiry that we had omitted a very important part of it. He thought so; I did not. Some Senators agreed with him, and some did not, but all the same we amended the joint resolution so as to strengthen it in the place where he said it was weak.

It will be very easy to amend this proposed law. The Senator can move to amend it, or he can take the report back; just get it away from the conference committee, if that can be done. However, if it can not be done, let us pass it just as the two Houses have passed it, and then amend the law immediately, so as to provide that Senators and Representatives shall not be exempted. But we should not allow any conference committee to legislate here.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I feel very confident that the conference committee would not have presented this matter if we had thought it would bring forward such a strong appeal for the sacred rules of the Senate. We talked about that matter a little, and I think it is true that not a day passes, while this body is in session, that we do not break the rules of the Senate. We have a right to set aside the rules of the Senate.

The conference committee in this case do not present the conference report without an explanation. We do not present the report as a finality. The wording of the report itself says that the conference committee asks the judgment of the two Houses on this particular point. If the judgment of the two Houses is that Members of Congress ought not to be included in the proposed law at this time, the conference committee is more than content to take back the report.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is begging the question. The Senator ought not to feel at all sensitive about it, because having made the explanation—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Just a moment there. The Senator from Wyoming has just said that the conference committee are not at all sensitive about it. They are perfectly willing to take back the report if that is the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. The judgment of the Senate is, it ought to go in, but not in this way.



Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. All that it asks is the judgment of the Senate as to this particular thing. That is why we brought in the report; that is what we are waiting for, and there is no sensitiveness whatever about it.

But I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the fact that an objection does not send the bill back to conference. An objection, under the rules of this body and the precedents of this body, only calls forth the judgment of the Senate upon the report. A single objection in the other House, as I stated, or a point of order, I understand, does send it back. But the objection here simply does what the committee asks—gives us the judgment of the Senate upon that point.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will pardon another word. I think the Senator from South Carolina has omitted a consideration which properly enters into this matter, and to suggest it I will read a portion of the second section—just the point of dispute:

Every officer or employee of the United States and every person acting for or on behalf of the United States in any official capacity under or by virtue of the authority of any Department or office of the Government thereof who shall, etc.

This is rather broad language. It not only includes any officer, by that designation, but provides that any person who, acting for or on behalf of the United States in an official capacity, shall do so and so shall be guilty of a certain offense. The point to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina is that in a popular sense, for instance, or in a qualified sense, a Senator or a Representative is acting in an official capacity on behalf of the United States when we legislate, though in strictness of constitutional law they are said to be officers of the State.

In order to clear up that difficulty and to present the matter fairly and frankly to the Senate, the committee suggest that they are in doubt as to whether the words "and every Member of Congress" would add to the statute. On the contrary, it might be suggested that it was simply explanatory of what the two Houses of Congress had theretofore intended to do and attempted to do. I submit, Mr. President, that we ought to consider that feature, if I have made myself clear upon it, in determining whether the technical rule, supposing we have violated it by bringing this report here, ought not to be set aside by the unanimous consent of the Senate and those words, which in a strictly technical sense it is conceded ought to be included, inserted in order to include each Member of the House and each member of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Texas does not understand me as objecting to what he is trying to accomplish?

Mr. CULBERSON. Not at all. But my point—I may not be able to make it clear—is that the insertion of these words in a certain sense adds nothing to the law—

Mr. TELLER. Then leave them out.

Mr. CULBERSON. But makes it clearer; and in order to guard against any doubt upon that subject we suggest that those words go in, so that the statute may be complete and may include all persons who ought to come within its inhibition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TILLMAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, certainly this is an unusual proposition and seems to establish a precedent that is rather dangerous. I should like to suggest to the Senator in charge of the conference report whether it would cause any material delay or make any material difference really if he would withhold the conference report until the two Houses can pass a concurrent resolution authorizing the conference committee to insert these words? Then the words will have gone through and taken the usual course, and the conference committee will have the authority to do it. It could not be a matter of more than twenty-four or forty-eight hours, and it will save the establishment of what I can not help but believe is a dangerous precedent.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts what is the difference in substance between authorizing it now, while the conference report is here, and authorizing it after the matter goes back to the conferees?

Mr. LODGE. I think there is a great deal of difference in substance. If conference committees are to have the power to come in here and propose new legislation on which the minds of the House have never met and which has never passed the Houses in due process, there will be no end to the amount of legislation that will be proposed, and it will pass according as the majority will rally to the conference committee. If we put this through in the form of a joint or a concurrent resolution, authorizing the committee to do it, it takes the regular course,

just like any other legislation of that kind, and it protects us from establishing what I think might easily fall into a dangerous precedent.

Mr. BACON. I desire to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that if it was attempted to have this passed by a vote in the Senate what he says as to its being an unfortunate precedent would certainly be eminently correct; but, as I understand the committee, they have recognized from the beginning that this could only be done by unanimous consent, and nothing which requires unanimous consent—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LODGE. That has been refused. Moreover, the point of order does not lie in the Senate as it does in the House. It ought to lie in the Senate and be fatal, but it does not, under our rule.

Mr. BACON. I understand unanimous consent has been refused, and the Senator from Texas says he recognizes that, in view of the objection of the Senator from Colorado, it can not be acted upon.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not think the committee understand that. The committee understand that the well-established precedents in this body are that a conference report does not go back upon a mere objection.

Mr. BACON. Oh, I understand that, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But it goes back at the will of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I have said—that one objection has no effect.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. So I understood.

Mr. LODGE. The only question in order is the question of consideration.

Mr. BACON. The Senator does not misunderstand me. I do not mean to suggest that, according to any regular rule, in acting upon conference reports, unanimous consent is needed, but I understood the Senators to present this report to the Senate with the recognition on their part that it was outside of the regular rule, and that unanimous consent would be required. I may be mistaken as to their presentation of that matter.

Mr. TILLMAN. The point I tried to make does not seem to impress some of my brethren here, and that is that other conferences might not be so open and square in dealing with us. I instanced a case in which totally new and strange and unheard of provisions were incorporated in a conference report. They never had been considered by either branch of Congress. They were passed through without anyone here detecting it. They became a law. Now, if we squint even toward not upholding our rules and not requiring conferees to understand their limitations, we certainly will throw down the barriers and we will have legislation by conferees. That is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that, but it seems to me exceedingly unfortunate that that rule should be strictly invoked against this particular measure.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is exceedingly unfortunate that some one did not discover the omission of these words from the act when it was on its passage. But I contend that we can better remedy it by an amendment or by a concurrent resolution, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, authorizing the conferees of the Senate to agree to the incorporation of these words, than we can afford to let it go through in this way. It may appear a small thing, but a small spark sometimes kindles a great fire.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose the proper motion, in order to get rid of this matter, would be to move to disagree. Of course, I have no more interest in this matter than has anyone else. I raised the objection because this proceeding is out of order, because it would tend to establish a precedent which would be very dangerous in the future, and because I believe it is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Every Senator here agrees that the committee had not any right to insert the words, and I think the committee knew they had not any right, but thought perhaps the Senate might waive the objection in this case. I am not disposed to waive it. Having made my objection, I leave the committee to take such steps with their report as they see fit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report submitted by the conference committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is there a point of order pending? Will a point of order lie against it? Will the Chair please rule, the matter having been brought to its attention, whether it is within the province and power of a conference committee to incorporate new legislation?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think that a point of order would lie against a conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Not according to our rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is a matter for the acceptance or rejection of the Senate. If the Chair sustained or overruled the point of order, it would find itself in the position of determining matters entirely within the control of the Senate. In the opinion of the Chair the question is on agreeing to the report submitted.

Mr. SPOONER. I suggest to the Senator who submitted this report that he let it go over until to-morrow—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There is no objection to that.

Mr. SPOONER. And let us see if we can not devise a way to remedy this difficulty.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. There is no objection to that course. There is no immediate haste.

Mr. SPOONER. That ought to be done.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Let it lie upon the table until it is called up.

Mr. PERKINS. If this matter is to go over till to-morrow, we may resume, I trust, the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire to withdraw the conference report?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire that it shall lie upon the table subject to call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14171) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the bill as it came from the House provided "for the construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, \$600,000," and to this the Senate committee has added the amendment—

*Provided, That no part of this sum shall be expended at Subig Bay, Philippine Islands.*

I assume that that brings up the controversy between Cavite, adjoining Manila, and Subig Bay, as to which shall constitute the great naval station and commercial base of the future.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say that while that may be the inference, it is not what influenced the Committee on Appropriations in providing that no part of this sum shall be expended at Subig Bay. What influenced the committee was that the amount, \$600,000, was too little to erect necessary works for defense of Subig Bay, and, second, that there is nothing at present in Subig Bay that needs protection, while the Hawaiian Islands and Manila Bay should be fortified at once.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But still, Mr. President, it raises the question whether these fortifications should be centered at Cavite, adjoining Manila, or Subig Bay, and there is a controversy between the Army and the Navy upon that question.

Until recently it was universally conceded that the fortifications should be centered in Subig Bay. Admiral Dewey, with a board of naval officers, made a report in favor of Subig Bay as the naval station of the future. That report was made some years ago, and the Navy Department, in pursuance of that report and in pursuance of legislative action upon the subject, has been making plans with reference to the construction of works of fortification at Subig Bay. It is only recently, I believe, that the Army has taken a position against that assumed by the Navy.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. It would be wrong for me to permit the Senator to make that statement unchallenged. This is not a difference between the Army and the Navy. A great many Army officers believe in Subig Bay as a great naval base. On the other hand, a great many naval officers believe that it is not yet time to take up the matter of Subig Bay. So there is a divided opinion in both the Navy and the Army, but it is in nowise a contest between the Navy and the Army as such. It is in nowise a contest of this kind on the part of the Committee on Appropriations that reports this bill. There is no member of the Committee on Appropriations who is not ready to take up the matter of Subig Bay and finally fortify it, if the Navy shall eventually choose that course and show that the works and fortifications there will be necessary. They do believe that

we should wait until we have an estimate, so as to know what it will cost to fortify that bay, as well as what the naval expenditures there will be.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It may be, Mr. President, that there is a difference of opinion amongst naval officers as to whether these works should be centered at Subig Bay or at Manila, but I am sure I am safe in saying that a preponderance of the sentiment of the naval officers, and particularly of those who have carefully examined the matter, is in favor of Subig Bay. I am also correct in saying that whilst there is a difference of opinion in the Army upon this question possibly the preponderance of sentiment in the Army is in favor of Cavite. So we have this contest going on.

Whilst the Taft party was in the Philippines during the past summer the matter was discussed there. General Corbin and, I believe, General Wood are strongly in favor of having all these works centered at Cavite. The Taft party inspected Cavite and Subig Bay, with a view of enabling them to arrive at some judgment and conclusion regarding them.

So, I say, we have here a provision which, in part at least, decides against Subig Bay and decides in favor of Cavite, for the bill as it stands with this amendment will permit the entire \$600,000 provided for by the bill to be expended at Cavite.

I submit that whilst this is a matter of controversy, and until the plans are fully presented to the Congress of the United States, and until we have an opportunity of reaching a deliberate judgment upon this question, it is unwise for Congress to permit any money whatever to be expended at Cavite. Yet under the bill the whole of it, or very nearly the whole of it, could be expended there.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator evidently has overlooked the language of the bill. The bill provides for seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian Islands, and provides for the Philippine Islands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is true. They could spend \$1 in the Hawaiian Islands and \$599,999 in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WARREN. It could all be expended in Subig Bay if needed, but it is not expected that any such course would be taken. I wish to say again—I have said it several times—Senators insist upon intended fortifications at Cavite. There is no intention of fortifying Cavite with this appropriation. It is simply to fortify the mouth of Manila Bay, and that of course fortifies, generally speaking, Manila and Cavite. If we went on exactly as is proposed by Admiral Dewey with Subig Bay we would still have to fortify Manila Bay, but not Cavite by itself.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Still, I insist, Mr. President, that we have not had such plans presented to us with reference to fortifications in the Philippine Islands as to enable us to form a judgment upon the question, and we are now asked by this fragmentary legislation to gradually commit the United States to the construction of fortifications at this place or that without having the plans presented to Congress which are necessary to enable it to form a judgment.

We have not yet determined whether we want any fortifications in the Philippine Islands and we are not in a position yet to determine that matter. We will have to consider the question of a coast line of the Philippine Islands larger than that of the entire United States, and we will have to consider the question as to whether, if we enter upon the fortification of those islands, it will not involve an expenditure in the end larger than that already accomplished in the coast defense of the United States. We will have to consider the question as to whether the fleet itself is not ample protection to those islands and whether it is not the most economical and the most adjustable protection of those islands. It seems to me we ought to have this entire question, in all its comprehension, presented to the Senate of the United States and not have it presented in this piecemeal way.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] says that this opposition is a suggestion that we intend to give up those islands; and he announced it as his opinion that the American people will never give up anything that they have acquired, that they will never give up land or anything unless they obtain something in return.

Mr. President, that will depend upon the question as to whether the United States will act according to the usual rules of wisdom or not. The Senator's expression would intend us to believe that his view is that when a nation has once gone wrong it should always stay wrong. I heard a Senator in the Philippine Islands say the United States never took a step backward. I presume he would say that if he fell into a well



or if he advanced into a quicksand. I assume that the United States, this great nation, will act as an individual under similar circumstances, and when its attention is called to action that may have been immature and unwise it will act upon judgment and reflection, whether that action involves going forward or going backward.

But there is one thing which has not yet been determined by the American people, and that is that we intend to hold permanently to the Philippines. Until we adopt a permanent policy regarding the Philippine Islands, I insist upon it that it is folly to commence a system of fortifications in those islands which, according to the testimony of some, will take from fifty to one hundred or one hundred and fifty million dollars.

When the treaty with Spain was ratified, what did the Senate say by solemn resolution? There were two resolutions voted for, one the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon] and the other the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McEnery]. One resolution declared it to be our purpose not to hold permanent sovereignty of the Philippines, but to withdraw and give over the government of those islands to its own people. The other also declared that it was not our purpose to hold permanent sovereignty of the Philippines; that it was not a part of our policy to make the Philippines an integral part of the United States. Whilst the Senate differed as to a declaration regarding the final disposition of the islands, there was a unanimous vote in the Senate that these islands were not to be held as an integral part of the United States, those who voted for the treaty insisting upon it that they were to be disposed of hereafter in a manner best suited to the interests of the people of the Philippine Islands and the people of the United States, the minority members insisting that they were to be held only for a brief time, with a view to turning over the government to the Filipino people.

So we stand of record, when the treaty with Spain was adopted, declaring against holding these islands as an integral part of the United States, and that declaration received the vote of every man in the Senate.

Now, have we made any declaration to the contrary? And what are the declarations of the parties regarding the subject? The Democratic party has uniformly taken the position that those islands are to be held in trust for their own people; that we are discharging the powers of sovereignty there in trust for the Filipino people, and that those powers are to be turned over to the Filipino people themselves.

What is the declaration now of the Republican party? That we hold these islands in trust for civilization and for the Filipino people; that we hold them simply because the Filipino people are not fitted for self-government, with the corresponding implication that when the Filipino people are prepared for self-government the government of those islands will be turned over to them.

And what are the declarations of the leading men in the Republican party charged with the enforcement of the policy regarding the Philippine Islands? Secretary Taft has uniformly declared throughout the Philippine Islands that our only right and our only duty and our only obligation there is to prepare those people for self-government; and with that view we are instructing them in a common language and teaching them the principles of self-government.

It is true he is indefinite as to the period of withdrawal. Why? Simply because he says it is impossible to tell when they will be prepared for self-government. Inasmuch as their preparation for that function is indefinite, he insists that the declaration itself shall be indefinite so far as time is concerned.

And what does the President of the United States say upon this subject? In a recent message touching upon the Philippine question he declared that it was the hope and the trust of our people that ultimately the Philippine Islands shall bear the same relation toward us that Cuba now does. What relation does Cuba bear to us? That of an independent Republic, protected by us, but having all the qualities that belong to self-government, with certain limitations imposed upon them by her own constitution and by her treaty with us, limitations simply involving our power to protect her against her own folly in the creation of debt and in the sanitation of the islands.

Now, Mr. President, if that be the ultimate purpose of the Republican party, as represented by its Chief Executive, what does it mean? Why, that those islands are to be held as a separate entity, absolutely distinct from the United States, with their own laws, with their own government, bound to us only by a single tie, and that is the commission that governs them, that commission ultimately but progressively to give way to a government of their own people when the Philippine Islands shall have acquired a common language and shall have acquired fitness for self-government.

If these islands are not to be held as an integral part of the United States, and if both parties unite in the assumption that they are to be held for the exercise of the powers of sovereignty there by the people themselves at some time or another, I ask whether it is a wise thing for us to expend millions and tens of millions and hundreds of millions in fortifying those islands, as if we intended permanently to retain them? Is it not the wise policy simply to maintain some port like Subig Bay or Batan Island as a naval station and coaling station in the future, to be held as a part of the great chain of naval stations and coaling stations throughout the world acquired by us without dependent peoples?

Now, there are two points that can be selected as a reservation when the time comes for withdrawal. One is Subig Bay, in the northern part of the island of Luzon, nearest to Hongkong. The other is Batan Island, lying to the southeast of Luzon. Batan has the advantage of being absolutely separated by water from the rest of the Philippine Islands; it has the advantage of having almost no population; it has the advantage of having large coal fields, and it has the advantage of a great port. So it has all the advantages, except, perhaps, the location, that the island of Hongkong has to the British Empire. That island has only come into prominence lately as a commercial station or naval station, and it adds to the advantages of Subig Bay the advantage of having great coal deposits of immense value.

As to Subig Bay, it is true it is a part of the great island of Luzon, but it is separated from the rest of the island by high mountains, and immediately around this bay there is a very sparse population, I believe, not aggregating more than 3,000 people. So with these high mountains encircling it, it can be easily protected against the rest of the island, and the harbor itself is one of exceptional capacity.

If we are to have a naval station, a commercial and coaling station, after we part from the Philippine Islands, it must necessarily be either Subig Bay—"Olongapo," as it is called—or the island of Batan. If we are to retain such a naval station, it is essential that we should center every dollar of our military expenditure upon that station.

Now, Mr. President, we are beginning to realize that there is no money in the Philippines. Different motives led the American people to hold on to the Philippines. The commercial sentiment was, of course, the strongest—the commercial sentiment united with the religious sentiment and an unthinking altruism regarding the holding of these islands. The church people wished to hold them because they wished to Christianize them. They now begin to realize that they are Christianized; that they are under the control of the Catholic Church, and they are likely to remain there. The Catholic Church is doing good work amongst them.

So far as the commercial sentiment of the country is concerned, we are beginning to realize that there is no money in the Philippines. There is no money in the Tropics anywhere. The temperate region has robbed the Tropics of their oldtime monopoly in certain products, so that to-day in the Temperate Zone we are producing sugar and tobacco, which used to be the monopoly of the Torrid Zone, a monopoly from which they made large profits; and we are beginning to realize that production can not be stimulated in the Tropics without either slave labor or forced labor. So the commercial sentiment of the country is beginning to realize that there is no money in the Philippines.

As to the altruists, their views are all tending to the conclusion that the best thing to do is to leave the government of those islands to their own people; that a democracy has no right to impose government by force upon people struggling to be a democracy; that a government of the people and for the people and by the people can not maintain anywhere consistent with its traditions a government by force.

Mr. President, the sentiment of this country is gradually growing in favor of the relinquishment of the Philippines, and we are now reaching a point where we can view the whole question in a nonpartisan spirit. The two parties are approaching each other upon this question. The declarations of the President and of Secretary Taft resemble the declarations which were made in the Bacon resolution, upon which the Democrats voted three or four years ago. So I insist upon it that it would be the highest folly for us to expend large sums of money in islands which we may yet withdraw from, and which we probably will withdraw from; and it is good judgment only to center our expenditures at a point which is likely to be held as a part of our commercial system in the future.

I am in hearty sympathy with this amendment to strike out all of the paragraph relating to the Philippine Islands, so that this entire appropriation will be for the Hawaiian Islands alone; and then later on we will consider our policy with ref-

erence to the Philippine Islands. We are about to consider it very soon in questions relating to the tariff. We will probably be called upon to consider it very soon in estimates for appropriations that will come from the War and Navy Departments with reference to comprehensive plans relating to the military and naval improvements there. It seems to me to be the height of wisdom to strike out from this bill every appropriation that relates to the Philippine Islands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will allow the committee amendments to go over. It is entirely dependent upon the other amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I certainly will place no obstacle in the way of a fair expression of the Senate upon the amendment proposed by the committee; but if on the desire of the Senator it is to be temporarily passed over, I should like first to make a few remarks in reply to one of his charges that this would be a wasteful expenditure of money. I will state that the estimate in the Book of Estimates, made originally by the Secretary of War, was, for Manila, \$2,000,000, which was reduced to \$500,000; for Subig Bay, \$500,000, which was reduced to \$240,000, and for Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, \$520,000, which was reduced to \$260,000. In the bill we simply provide that this money shall not be expended in Subig Bay, for the reasons which have been stated over and over again. We have no plan, no system, that has been adopted for the fortification of that port, and the money already appropriated has not yet been used.

But I think it would be unwise to accept the amendment to strike out the appropriation for the Philippine Islands. We have already spent nearly \$3,000,000 on fortifications at the island of Corregidor, and the estimate required to complete them is \$2,000,000; not, as has been stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] so pertinently, for the fortification of Manila Bay, but for the defense of the great city of Manila, with a population of nearly a quarter of a million.

I want to answer the Senator from Wisconsin, who asked me the question before leaving the Chamber, why it was particular ports were named in this bill, when heretofore we have made these appropriations, as he understood it, in bulk for the Board of Fortifications and Ordnance to expend? That is very true, Mr. President. In 1883, in March, I think it was, Congress provided for the appointment of a Board of Coast Defense, consisting of the Secretary of War, two engineer officers, two ordnance officers, and two civilians. We made, however, no appropriations for their work until 1888. At that time the board organized and was known as "the Endicott Board." That Board completed a plan for each port—twenty-two ports in the United States, on the Atlantic coast and on the Pacific coast, with detailed plans for each one of those ports. Under those plans we have expended \$120,000,000, in round numbers; \$65,000,000 have gone for emplacements and guns, and the other \$55,000,000 have been expended in the purchase of sites for torpedo stations, arsenals, and other accessories that were necessary for use in connection with the fortification of the different ports.

On January 31, 1905, the President, by authority of Congress, appointed a new board to revise the plans of the Endicott Board, and as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has read, they have classified them, and twenty-nine different ports, I think, have been named; among them, as he states, Subig as one which they have recommended should be fortified. They have left out quite a number of other places—I have in mind one in the State which I have the honor in part to represent—the great city of Los Angeles, in a county containing three or four hundred thousand people, on the harbor of which, San Pedro, the Government has expended over \$3,000,000 in building a sea wall and a harbor of refuge; yet that is not embraced in the places provided for. I only refer to it incidentally in passing. I wish to show that the plan of that Board has not yet been fully matured. As evidence of that, they give us no recommendation, no estimates, no plans for the fortification of our insular possessions.

California, Mr. President, is one of the brightest gems in our constellation of States. Pardon me for alluding to it in endearing terms. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] regrets that he is not a resident of that State or a citizen of it. True they may not send their best men to represent them in Congress, but they send men who are loyal to the great interests of their people. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that, if he lived there long enough, he might have a chance to represent that State. If we could have the benefit of his great learning and his great experience, I am sure it would add tenfold to the result of the work that her present representatives have been able to accomplish.

Mr. LODGE. Is that not a digression?

Mr. PERKINS. True, Mr. President, I am digressing. If the amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts should prevail, he had better take the whole bill from your committee and revise it.

Mr. LODGE. I have not proposed any amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. I thought the Senator proposed the one that is pending.

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], a member of the Senator's own committee, has offered the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, in this bill there are \$200,000 appropriated for guns for the insular possessions. The appropriations to which the Senator referred, which were made last year, were for guns which are in the process of being manufactured at the different arsenals of our country.

The reason we have named these ports this year was that a member of our committee offered the following amendment, to which we all gave our sanction:

Hereafter all estimates for fortifications of insular possessions of the United States shall be made and submitted to Congress, showing the amount proposed to be expended at each harbor in each insular possession.

That was done for the reason that much opposition developed in doing anything in our insular possessions, so far as the fortification of different ports in those possessions was concerned.

I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, while we have appropriated this money in bulk heretofore and have left it to the Board of Coast Defenses and Fortifications, to which I have referred, yet the information which they have always furnished your committee is in print of the number of guns, the emplacements, and the number of mortars with which they intend to fortify each port. They have brought to your subcommittee the blueprints and explained them to us fully in detail; but we do not wish to publish to the world our system of defense, the number or the caliber of our guns, or the ammunition that we were to use with them.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from California did me the honor to refer to me. He does not mean to imply that I sought to secure the publication of these military secrets to the world, does he?

Mr. PERKINS. I am replying to the inquiry the Senator propounded a while ago in regard to our departure from the system which heretofore prevailed. The reason was that your committee have brought into the Senate in the past ten or twelve years, during which time I have been a member of the committee, this information in a condensed form, without going into details, and I am only endeavoring to explain why there was this year put into the bill appropriations for those ports in the insular possessions which have not heretofore appeared.

Mr. SPOONER. If it will not disturb the Senator from California, I should like to ask him a question for information.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the amount of money that it is estimated will be required for fortifications in Hawaii?

Mr. PERKINS. In the Book of Estimates, which I have before me, the estimate is \$2,000,000 for Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, \$520,000 to be expended during the coming year; but the whole amount necessary, according to private information I have from the Department, will be two or three million dollars to fortify Honolulu Harbor and Pearl Harbor, where it is contemplated to make a naval station, as the Senator is aware.

Mr. SPOONER. The bill appropriates \$600,000 for the construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. How much of that \$600,000, if the Senator will be kind enough to tell me, is provided for the Philippines and how much for Hawaii?

Mr. PERKINS. About \$300,000 for the Hawaiian Islands and about \$300,000 for the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SPOONER. Then, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado should be adopted, the entire sum would not be necessary?

Mr. PERKINS. Then the whole \$600,000 would be expended in the Hawaiian Islands. I think it would not be advisable to adopt that amendment, for the reason that we have appropriated in this bill every dollar that the War Department desires in order to purchase sites. There has been a combination made against the Government to charge extravagant prices for the site near Pearl Harbor.

Mr. SPOONER. I prophesied a couple of years ago that that would happen.

Mr. PERKINS. For that reason, if for no other, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado should not prevail. Though he is generally very attentive, at the time this matter was being considered by the committee the Senator from Colorado had so many other duties that he was not able to be present in committee. I am satisfied if he had been there, had



listened to the testimony, and investigated the subject, as we have done, that he would have been of a different opinion.

Mr. SPOONER. I have a notion that if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado be adopted, it would be eminently proper to reduce the appropriation of \$600,000 for Hawaii to \$300,000.

Mr. PERKINS. I think so. I think the information of the committee is that that is all that can be advantageously expended this year.

Mr. FORAKER. Before the Senator passes from that point, I should like to inquire what progress has been made in acquiring sites for the seacoast batteries at Hawaii, and what progress has been made in acquiring the necessary ground at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. PERKINS. As to several tracts of land, condemnation proceedings are now pending in the courts of Hawaii. The courts, however, move justly, but slowly at times, in our insular possessions; and so the titles have not been fully adjudicated. Other tracts have been bonded for certain sums, and it is claimed the coming year will place the Government in possession of all necessary sites which will be required in Hawaii.

Mr. SPOONER. Can the Senator estimate the sum?

Mr. PERKINS. That I am unable to say.

Mr. FORAKER. The estimated cost will not exceed, as I understand, what has already been appropriated on that account.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state that the amount of money which the War Department asked for sites has been appropriated in each annual bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I am talking about the site at Pearl Harbor. As I understand it, we made an appropriation a year ago, and that appropriation has not been used.

Mr. PERKINS. That is also the case at Honolulu.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes. The appropriation heretofore made is sufficient, so far as anyone is at present advised, in all probability, to pay for all the ground that is being condemned.

Mr. PERKINS. I so understand.

Mr. FORAKER. And this appropriation is intended to cover the sites for seacoast batteries at Pearl Harbor and Honolulu. Now, how much of it, can the Senator tell us, is intended to pay for sites?

Mr. PERKINS. The amount has not been segregated, so far as I am informed, but it was estimated, in round numbers, that from two or three hundred thousand dollars could be advantageously used in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. FORAKER. I will ask the Senator if that did not cover not only the sites, but also a part of the cost of establishing batteries?

Mr. PERKINS. We have also provided in another place for the sites and emplacements. In one place in the bill we have provided for the manufacture of various guns of different calibers.

Mr. FORAKER. I had reference to the emplacements and the general preparation necessary to be made to receive the armament, whatever it may be. If that is provided for in another part of the bill, is it not true that a good deal more than \$600,000 will be needed in order to pay for a site for these seacoast batteries and for the erection of emplacements and the necessary preparation to receive the armament?

Mr. PERKINS. It will require about a million and a half to two million dollars more; but it will not be necessary to make that available for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know what is the plan of the War Department.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state also to the Senator as to the guns the War Department is considering the advisability of increasing the caliber of coast-defense guns from 12 to 14 inches. It is said that with the high explosives which they use in the 14-inch gun they will get 50 per cent more power, more energy, more force, and more destructive ability than from the 12-inch gun. The 14-inch gun will expel a shell from the muzzle of the gun 2,550 feet per second, going with an energy as it is expelled from the gun of 47½ tons, carrying nearly 5 miles, and penetrating steel armor of 12 inches in thickness at that distance.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I want to ascertain from the Senator from California—I should like to, at any rate, before he takes his seat—what, in his judgment, will be a sufficient sum to appropriate for these seacoast batteries in Hawaii? I supposed that it was the purpose of the War Department to acquire the sites and proceed at once to the preparation necessary for receiving the armament, and that they were perhaps limiting the appropriation on account of sites for seacoast batteries only because of this general plan, which was requiring so much money. But it seems to me that the amount of \$600,000, if I am correctly advised, could all be used to good advantage. I think

they will go right forward with their work, acquire sites, and make the preparations necessary for receiving the armament. The Senator, however, knows more about that than I do.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will say that your committee are in full accord with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and feel that every dollar that can be advantageously expended in fortifying this very desirable point in the Hawaiian Islands should be used. Their information is presented in their report to the Senate that this \$600,000 should be divided according to the judgment of this new Board of Fortifications and Ordnance, consisting of the Secretary of War, Hon. William H. Taft, Lieutenant-General Chaffee, Major-General Greely, General Crozier, the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief of Artillery, the Chief of Engineers, two members of the Navy, Rear-Admiral Thomas and Captain Sperry, and also a distinguished Army officer as secretary of the Board. This report only reached us a few days since. It was not printed, and therefore your committee did not have an opportunity of examining it at that time.

Mr. CLAY. I do not understand the Senator to say that \$600,000 could be advantageously spent in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. PERKINS. I stated that your committee were advised that two or three hundred thousand dollars was all that could be expended advantageously in the Hawaiian Islands during the coming year.

Mr. CLAY. I know the Senator is aware of the fact that the last Congress in passing the fortifications appropriation bill especially provided that an itemized statement should be furnished to the Committee on Appropriations of how much money should be spent in each one of these harbors in the future; and really, I believe that the appropriation bill ought to specify how much money is to be spent on each harbor.

I know the Senator is perfectly familiar with the fact that the Secretary of War only asked for \$260,000 for the Hawaiian Islands. He asked for \$500,000 for Manila and for \$260,000 for Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, and he himself says that is the amount of money that can be advantageously expended there next year. Consequently, if that amendment should prevail, it would be necessary to decrease the appropriation from \$600,000 to \$260,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Only \$520,000 was asked for Honolulu and Pearl Harbor. That was reduced to \$260,000 in the Book of Estimates, which the Senator has quoted.

Mr. CLAY. That is correct—\$260,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Therefore, I reiterate that which has been stated again and again, that I do not think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado should prevail. I believe that if the Senate should resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole and examine the testimony which we had before us in the committee—testimony which we can not present without giving too much publicity to it—they would agree with the conclusions at which your committee have arrived.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks a part of this fund should be appropriated to the fortification of Cavite?

Mr. PERKINS. I do, most certainly. There is no question about it. It is true that my friend from Georgia—

Mr. BACON. I am not speaking of Corregidor Island; I am speaking of Cavite itself.

Mr. PERKINS. I am speaking of Corregidor Island.

Mr. BACON. That is 30 miles from Cavite.

Mr. PERKINS. Aye; but it guards the entrance to the bay.

Mr. BACON. I did not misunderstand the Senator, but he misunderstood me. I am not speaking of Corregidor Island.

Mr. PERKINS. I am not advised as to Cavite. We have, however, a naval station there; we have machine shops there, and the testimony of the Bureau of Equipment and the Bureau of Yards and Docks is that it is ample for all purposes at this time.

Mr. BACON. I had reference especially to Cavite itself, not to the island of Corregidor.

Mr. PERKINS. I can not speak as to that.

Mr. WARREN. I had the privilege of looking over the plans for the islands. There was nothing proposed for Cavite, as has been stated a great many times on the floor; but it is proposed to fortify the entrance to Manila Bay, which, of course, protects Cavite as well as Manila. I do not understand there is a dollar to be expended on fortifications at Cavite proper from this proposed appropriation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Massachusetts requested that the amendment under consideration should be passed over temporarily.

Mr. PERKINS. I have no objection to the amendment being passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 8, line 9. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 8, line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two hundred" and insert "five hundred and sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defense for the insular possessions, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$365,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first amendment which was passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, beginning on line 8, the committee propose to insert the following:

#### POWDER FACTORY.

For the erection and equipment of a powder factory, with its necessary communications and accessory structures, upon such reservation now or that may hereafter be under the control of the War Department as may be selected by the Secretary of War, \$125,000.

Mr. PERKINS. At the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], I will ask that the consideration of that amendment go over until to-morrow morning, when we will take it up immediately after the routine morning business. The Senator from Virginia desires to make some remarks in relation to this subject-matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over. The next amendment which was passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, under the heading "Fortifications in insular possessions," line 6, after the word "dollars," the committee propose to insert:

*Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended at Subig Bay, Philippine Islands.

So as to make the clause read:

For construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, \$600,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended at Subig Bay, Philippine Islands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "does" have it.

Mr. PERKINS. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest to the Senator from California that we first take a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to save time. That will settle the whole question.

Mr. PERKINS. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the vote will be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 6, before the word "Islands," it is proposed by Mr. TELLER to strike out the words "and Philippines;" so as to read:

For construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian Islands, \$600,000.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. LODGE. Let us have the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McENERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DEWEY], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALLAFERRO], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] that we transfer our pairs, which will allow us both to vote. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. If it is agreeable to the Senator we can transfer our pairs, so that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] will stand paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE].

Mr. PATTERSON. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I vote "nay."

Mr. PATTERSON. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 23, as follows:

#### YEAS—25.

Bacon	Dillingham	Lodge	Rayner
Bailey	Dubois	McCreary	Spooner
Blackburn	Forster	McCumber	Teller
Brandegee	Frye	Newlands	Tillman
Bulkeley	Hansbrough	Overman	
Burrows	Kean	Patterson	
Clay	Latimer	Pettus	

#### NAYS—23.

Allee	Carter	Fulton	Perkins
Allison	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Piles
Ankeny	Cullom	Gamble	Sutherland
Beveridge	Dick	Hemenway	Warner
Burkett	Dolliver	Long	Warren
Burnham	Foraker	Penrose	

#### NOT VOTING—41.

Aldrich	Depew	Knox	Platt
Alger	Dryden	La Follette	Proctor
Berry	Elkins	McEnery	Scott
Burton	Flint	McLaurin	Simmons
Carmack	Frazier	Mallory	Smoot
Clapp	Gearin	Martin	Stone
Clark, Mont.	Gorman	Millard	Tallaferro
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Money	Wetmore
Crane	Hayburn	Morgan	
Culherson	Hopkins	Nelson	
Daniel	Kittredge	Nixon	

So Mr. TELLER's amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PERKINS. The amendment is not necessary, as by the vote of the Senate there has been stricken out all appropriations for fortifications in the Philippine Islands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator withdraw the amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to call attention to the fact that as this clause now stands it reads "for construction of seacoast batteries in the Hawaiian Islands, \$600,000." The estimate of the War Department is only \$260,000. I move to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$260,000."

Mr. PERKINS. I accept the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 6, before the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out "six hundred" and insert "two hundred and sixty;" so as to read "\$260,000."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. I request that the further consideration of the bill be postponed until to-morrow, for the purpose of giving the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] an opportunity to make a speech on the powder question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the bill will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. If that is the only question in abeyance, why would it not be wise to have the bill reported to the Senate—

Mr. PERKINS. There is no objection to that.

Mr. ALLISON. And leave the one amendment undisposed of?

Mr. PERKINS. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa is a good one. Therefore I suggest that the bill be reported to the Senate, and the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in.

Mr. ALLISON. That perhaps can not be done, leaving one amendment in the air. I suggest to the Senator that he ask unanimous consent that this shall be the only matter left for consideration to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. Agree to all the other amendments and leave this one open.

Mr. ALLISON. Agree to all the other amendments, so that the bill can be taken out of the Committee of the Whole when this single amendment is disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will kindly restate his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered closed in Committee of the Whole, all the amendments having been agreed to except the amendment relative to the powder matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I call attention to the amendment on page 8, line 16, where there is quite a large increase over the amount authorized by the bill as it passed the House. The Philippine Islands having been stricken out—

Mr. PERKINS. I will say to the Senator that has been agreed to, and an explanation was made at the time. It does



not disturb the autonomy of the bill at all to have it remain as it is.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa there may be other matters in connection with this bill that we would like to keep open until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa for unanimous consent?

Mr. HEMENWAY. There are other items in the bill which I should like to discuss to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I would be glad if the Senator from California would go on with the other amendments this evening.

Mr. LODGE. And finish the rest of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we had better perfect the bill this evening.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Now the Senator from Indiana can offer any amendment he desires.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I suggest to the Senator that I would like to look into the amendments I have in view, and if the bill is to go over as to one amendment, I see no reason why it should not go over as to the others, so that Senators may have an opportunity to look into them.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw my suggestion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over till to-morrow.

#### PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13103) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask the Senator from North Dakota to yield to me that I may call up a concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask if unanimous consent has been given.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has not been given.

Mr. McCUMBER. After that is given, I will yield to the Senator, if there is no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill indicated by him? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Mr. PENROSE. With the consent of the Senator from North Dakota, I ask unanimous consent to call up the concurrent resolution relating to the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. PENROSE on the 13th instant, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Pennsylvania," to insert "commencing;" so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the invitation extended to the Congress of the United States by the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, Pa., to attend the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, to be held at Philadelphia, Pa., commencing April 17, 1906, be, and is hereby, accepted.*

That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a committee to consist of six Senators and ten Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress to attend the celebration referred to and to represent the Congress of the United States on that occasion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me to call up a bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator from Maine that quite a number of Senators have requested that I yield to them for the purpose of calling up bills, and I have said to them that the pension appropriation bill is probably shorter than theirs.

Mr. FRYE. Very well. I withdraw the request.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13103) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes, which

had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read to the end of line 9, on page 8.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota desire that the committee amendment shall be considered when it is reached in the reading of the bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. I prefer it should be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 2, line 7, before the word "age," to insert "the;" and in the same line, after the word "age," to strike out "is" and insert "of 62 years and over shall be considered;" so as to read:

*And provided further, That the age of 62 years and over shall be considered a permanent specific disability within the meaning of the pension laws.*

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator who has this bill in charge whether that would give to every soldier who is 62 years of age a pension if he asks for it?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it will.

Mr. TELLER. That is the purpose of the provision?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. TELLER. I do not quarrel with the purpose at all. I merely wanted to know.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota. Mr. McCUMBER. I have thought it proper to make a very brief statement concerning this bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment before he makes his statement?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 9, after the word "laws," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

*And provided further, That hereafter in the adjudication of pension claims under the general law the soldier shall not be required to prove the continuance of the alleged disability or disabilities from the date of his discharge from the service to the time application is made for pension or increase of pension, it being sufficient for him to show that the disability was incurred in the service and line of duty and that it exists at the time of medical examination.*

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator having charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, has listened to the amendment with sufficient attention to say that he sees no objection to it, I will not detain the Senate a moment. I will say, however, that the amendment, hastily drawn, and which, if it is inserted in the bill, will go into conference, is designed to cover a very few cases. I have here a letter from a Massachusetts soldier which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD, detailing his experience in the Pension Bureau.

There is a class of soldiers who when they left the service suffering from disabilities were too proud to ask for pensions. Some of them did not need the money, and others felt that it was not quite the patriotic thing to do. Their disabilities were unquestioned at the time they left the service. Forty or forty-five years after that time they become impoverished. They go to the Pension Bureau and ask for a pension, and they are required by the Bureau to prove the continuance, year by year, of that disability. It is not sufficient that it exists to-day, but they must prove absolutely that it has existed year by year. The medical men who treated them are dead, as a rule, and it is an utter impossibility for them to establish this proof.

It seems to me if they can show by hospital record or otherwise that they were disabled when they left the service, in the line of duty, and when they make application for a pension or increase of pension can show that the same disability exists, that ought to be enough. That is the purport of the amendment, and I hope the Senator will not object to it and will let it become a part of the bill and go into conference at least.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have no objection whatever to the amendment. I tried to listen carefully to its reading, and I think it covers the intended object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the letter which I send to the desk be inserted in the RECORD. It explains one case very fully, and it impressed me so profoundly, I having thought of this in former years, that I felt necessity existed for amending the bill in this way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire.

H 5. 78